

SPARTACUS' UPRISING
AND
SOVIET HISTORICAL WRITING

by

W. Z. RUBINSOHN

Translated by

J. G. GRIFFITH

THE predicament of Soviet citizens who have earned international reputations for themselves is generally well known to the outside world. Several of them have been able to leave the Soviet Union and so publicize their distaste for the more repressive aspects of "the system" under which they grew up. The picture however must be incomplete so long as we in the West remain ignorant of the plight of academics and others who lack effective means of making their feelings and sufferings known. Dr. Rubinsohn has done much to illuminate this dark corner by applying his intimate knowledge of Slavonic languages and literature to collecting and sifting the source-material, some of it unavailable in Western libraries, in order to explain this unhappy situation against the background of the peculiar and far-reaching impact which the episode of Spartacus, in itself trivial, has had on Marxist writing and thought. Oppressed academics have often shown great personal heroism in impossible circumstances where the reward for scholarly competence and intellectual honesty has all too often been dismissal, imprisonment or internal exile, and at worst the 'tragic fate' of extermination. Dr. Rubinsohn's work appeared in German in 1983, fully documented and remarkable for its objective treatment of fascinating and often sensational material. It is presented here in an English translation, prepared by a former Public Orator of Oxford University (who reviewed the German version in *Classical Review* 35 (1985) pp. 325-7), so as to make it accessible to a wider public.

This book is addressed not only to ancient historians, but to all who wish to be fully informed about the intellectual world of our time. Professional students of Soviet affairs will be saved hours of frustrating search by the extensive bibliography, which has been substantially updated and corrected in details from the original German one. The cost of reproducing this variegated mass of complex information in English would have been prohibitive, but for the versatility of the Lasercomp typesetting process available at the Oxford University Computing Service, which, with the help of an accomplished printer and an understanding publisher, has enabled this short but highly revealing book to be issued in a readable form and at a very modest price.

From all booksellers, price £3.50 (\$6.00 U.S.) post free,
or direct from OXBOW BOOKS, 10 ST. CROSS
ROAD, HOLYWELL, OXFORD (0865 241249)

SPARTACUS' UPRISING
AND
SOVIET HISTORICAL WRITING

by

WOLFGANG ZEEV RUBINSOHN

Translated from an updated and corrected text

of the

German Edition of 1983

by

JOHN G. GRIFFITH

Emeritus Fellow of Jesus College, Oxford

and sometime

Public Orator of the University of Oxford.

OXFORD

1987

SPARTACUS' UPRISING
AND SOVIET HISTORICAL WRITING

This translation is published by agreement with
Universitäts Verlag, Konstanz. The original German edition appeared in
the series *Xenia: Konstanz Essays and Studies in Ancient History*, edited by
Wolfgang Schuller.

© Universitätsverlag Konstanz GmbH, 1983.

ISBN 0 9511243 1 5



*Gladiators in combat,
as shown on an inscribed earthenware vase of c. 200 A. D.
now in the Colchester and Essex Museum*

*(Reproduced from a Museum postcard,
by kind permission of the Museum)*

Distributed by Oxbow Books, 10 St. Cross Road, Holywell, Oxford.

Typeset by the translator on a Monotype Lasercomp
at Oxford University Computing Service, 13 Banbury Road, Oxford.

Printed by Oxonian Rewley Press Ltd., Botley, Oxford

TRANSLATION OF THE EDITOR'S PREFACE TO THE GERMAN EDITION

IN the series known as 'Xenia' shorter studies are mainly published, which were originally delivered as lectures at the University of Konstanz. Generally these cover areas of research which are not represented in the University's curriculum, and are aimed not only at experts but also at a non-specialist but interested general public.

The author of the present volume, Martin Wolfgang (Zeev) Rubensohn, was born in Berlin in 1932. At the end of 1938 he emigrated with his parents to Harbin in what was then known as Manchukuo, which after being initially controlled by Soviet troops reverted to China in 1946. At the conclusion of his training as a Russian-English translator, he eventually immigrated to Israel in 1950. After studying History and Classical Antiquity, he obtained his Ph. D. at the University of Tel Aviv, where he has been teaching since 1966.

His areas of research are slavery in antiquity, with special reference to the slave-uprisings, and also the history of his chosen subject. Both are to be recognised in the present study, which is based on a lecture delivered in the summer of 1981.

The publication of the essays in this series have been made possible in large measure by the Maecenas-like generosity of Heinz Breuninger. Right up to the time of his sudden death he showed a great interest in the work of the Chair of Ancient History here. The title of the series (which means in Greek 'guest-gifts') is an expression of grateful thanks not only to the individual contributors for their essays, but also to Heinz Breuninger and the Breuninger Foundation for all their help. For that reason the whole series is dedicated to Heinz Breuninger's memory.

WOLFGANG SCHULLER
(Editor of 'Xenia')

CONTENTS

PREFATORY MATTER.	i
THE UPRISING OF SPARTACUS.	I
APPENDIX 'A'	23
NOTES.	24
SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY.	40
APPENDIX 'B'	54

TRANSLATOR'S FOREWORD

My interest in the spectacular discoveries of Classical antiquities which have been recovered from archaeological sites in Bulgaria, especially in recent years, has led to close and rewarding contacts with Bulgarian colleagues and eventually in 1977 to an invitation to contribute a paper to the Congress in commemoration of the 2050th Anniversary of the uprising of Spartacus. This was held in Blagoevgrad, a town in the mountains some 70 miles South of Sofia, which, if a likely emendation to the text of a passage in Plutarch is accepted, may have been the area from which Spartacus himself came.¹ In my letter of reply I pointed out that as a pupil of the late Professor Last, Camden Professor of Roman History at Oxford in the 1930's, and others who taught me in my undergraduate years, my contribution would almost certainly contain material at variance with the bulk of the other papers likely to be presented. I added however that in my view it was essential for all shades of tenable opinion to be represented at what I understood to be a scholarly occasion, unless the Congress was to forfeit the respect to which an international gathering with a serious purpose was entitled. I felt that I could on this understanding properly accept the invitation.

The occasion was indeed an enjoyable one, but at the same time highly disconcerting. I was hardly prepared (though perhaps I should have been) for the more extravagant flights of fancy which made up much of the programme, whether in papers delivered in languages I understood or in those whose drift I had to infer from the simultaneous translation which was thoughtfully provided. If Rubinsohn's essay (which it fell to me years later to review²) had been available to me at the time, I should not have been surprised at what I heard, and would have presented my own paper with more assurance and more understanding of the predicament in which so many of one's East European colleagues unhappily find themselves. My paper was, in effect, a development of Last's position, as set out in *Cambridge Ancient History*, (vol. ix, pp. 329-332), coupled with an invitation to those present to produce any shreds of ancient evidence they could which I might have overlooked in order to substantiate such embarrassingly ludicrous descriptions of Spartacus as "a precursor of social revolution" or "the leader of a proletarian unity-front" *et alia simillima*. I urged the audience to try if they could to reconcile these distortions of history with the wording of the ancient texts about Spartacus, producing at the Congress well-thumbed texts of Plutarch, Appian, Sallust and others to facilitate their task. I also mentioned certain awkward facts which make nonsense of the Marxist glorification of this romantic but minor

figure in the history of the late Roman republic. Thus, to name only the most obvious, if Spartacus had really dealt at the existing slave-owning social order 'a blow from which it never recovered', how was it that only 8 years later the dangerous Catiline could safely be expelled from Rome and driven into Etruria, an area into which Spartacus had penetrated during his insurrection? Again, why did Sicily, in spite of notorious misgovernment by the pro-praetor Verres in the 70's, give Spartacus no effective help or support?

To these and other telling points no reply was, or indeed could have been forthcoming in the Conference room, though the Chairman did his gallant best to get some sort of discussion going, but embarrassment was saved by the timely announcement of lunch. What was however interesting to me was the sincere warmth of the response accorded to my paper in conversation afterwards by many of those attending, including some whom I had thought hardly likely to react favourably. This was to me a revealing introduction at first-hand to the intellectual schizophrenia of orthodox Marxist historians, whose watchword must surely be (to adapt Ovid): *video meliora proboque; deteriora sequenda mihi*. Or, to modify a proverb: 'needs must, when the devil of *Partijnost* drives'. For reasons of prudence I forbear from saying more, and I have 'forgotten on purpose' the names of my interlocutors, — ἐκὼν ἐπελαθόμεν, after the manner of Herodotus. For it can be dangerous to tell the truth in the Alice-in-Wonderland world of academe in which one's East European colleagues must perforce prosecute their studies, and it would lie very heavily on my conscience if any one of them should, as a result of an indiscretion of mine, suffer the 'tragic human fate' of P. F. Preobraženskij, who 'vanished' in 1937 and was put to death in 1941 after four years' imprisonment, or that of G. Sergeevskij, who 'disappeared' in 1938. Both had given truthful reviews of a book on Spartacus written by a Party functionary which left the reader in no kind of doubt about the serious scholarly shortcomings of the work in question (*v. infr.*, pp. 4, 8). By conscientiously discharging their duty as critics, both paid with their lives for their obedience to Juvenal's resounding exhortation³ to maintain one's intellectual integrity, come what may: *Phalaris licet imperet...* (how better can one express in Latin 'under a totalitarian government?'):

*summum crede nefas animam praeferre pudori,
et propter vitam vivendi perdere causas.*

By re-issuing this book, with its more than adequate documentation, in an English translation at as modest a cost as possible by the use of Lasercomp type-setting, the author and I hope that it will be within the reach of many, besides Classical scholars, who have the task of teaching the next generation how to come to terms with the harsh realities of the world in which they are growing up. For all of us, whether we are teachers by profession or otherwise concerned with the intellectual climate of our day, need to be aware and to

demonstrate our awareness to others of the need for eternal vigilance in order to safeguard what should be a universal right to independence of expression of reasoned thought and criticism, regardless, if need be, of the eminence of one's opponents in controversy. This can all too easily be taken for granted, but once it is lost, life at all levels ceases to be the exhilarating adventure it should be, and degenerates into a dreary penance. If this small book should succeed to some extent in showing not what may happen but what has happened within living memory in a part of the world which once possessed a great cultural heritage, then Preobraženskij and Sergeevskij, two gallant defenders of academic freedom, will not have died in vain. Neither will the lives of Spartacus and his followers have been wasted: Marxists have only themselves to blame if, by having misguidedly elevated him to the status of a martyr-figure, they find that some 2000 years after his death he has exploded in their faces.

The translator is very conscious of the uneven style of his English rendering, but this is not unintended. Dr. Rubinsohn's German text reflects with great sensitivity the opacity, the elusive innuendoes and on occasion crudenesses of some of the quotations from the Russian, yet these features must be reflected. At the same time the essay had to be presented in a reasonably readable form, having regard to the paramount need for strict accuracy, so as to ensure, as far as possible, that it was proof against captious criticism and allegations of misrepresentation, to which offended marxists are likely to resort in face of this damning indictment of the scholarly attainment of their colleagues over the years. The conflict between elegance of expression and ungainly precision does not admit of resolution. He also wishes to thank Dr. Kurt Möser, formerly Lektor in German at Jesus College, Oxford, for his percipient help, while the author and the translator together would like to express their gratitude to the Editor of this series (*Xenia*), Professor Dr. Wolfgang Schuller of the University of Konstanz, as well as to the Publishers, Universitätsverlag Konstanz, for generously giving permission for this English version to be published.

1. The neat emendation *Μαιδικού* in Plutarch, *Crassus*, ch. 8, 2 is due to K. Ziegler; the transmitted text (*Νομαδικού*) is corrupt and the name of a Thracian tribe is very likely at this point.
2. See *Classical Review*, n. s. vol. xxxv, (1985), pp. 325-7. The title of W. Z. Rubinsohn's book is *Der Spartakus-Aufstand und die sowjetische Geschichtsschreibung*, published in the series *Xenia* (Konstanz: Universitätsverlag, 1983).
3. From Juvenal, viii. 81, 83-4; in English:

*'though Phalaris issue the order, ...
Think it the nadir of shame to prefer your life to your honour,
And for the sake of survival to forfeit the reasons for living'.*

(Phalaris was the tyrant of Agragas (Agrigentum) in Sicily, who had the deplorable habit of boiling dissidents in a brazen bull).

THE intellectual attitudes of historians, both in antiquity and in modern times, their ways of evaluating and using their sources,—indeed everything covered by the word historiography—have become in recent years a rapidly developing area of research. This is highly relevant to the interest which historians in the West have shown in Soviet Ancient History. In the last two decades several important contributions have appeared, dealing, among other matters, with the 'Great Slave Uprisings' of the declining phase of the Roman Republic.¹ A specific investigation of the subject of this book seems not as yet to be available, although Soviet historical writing on this topic tells us a great deal about the peculiar character of Soviet research. The case of Spartacus is indeed illuminating, since the picture of him which is current in the Soviet Union is quite different from that of other leaders of uprisings, or indeed of all other personalities in antiquity.² It is not however only in the Soviet Union that a peculiar picture of Spartacus has been formed. As early as the middle of the 18th century he had been elevated in Western European literature into an idealized champion of the cause of the oppressed and enslaved.³ So it was no mere chance that a small number of extreme German Social Democrats, headed by Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg, signed their pacifist appeal during the first World War with the name of Spartacus, and in 1918, when the framework of their organization took shape, they called it the 'Spartacus League'.⁴ Although Lenin criticized this group, the murder of Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg ensured them a place in the pantheon of Soviet revolutionary heroes.⁵ The glamour of the modern Spartacus-group has thus thrown the picture of Spartacus into still higher relief. That is how the naming of the Workers' Sports Clubs in the 1920's in Czechoslovakia, Germany and the USSR came about. To emphasize their liberating and progressive character,—in contrast to the bourgeois ones—they named them after Spartacus, and when the All-Soviet Games took place for the first time in 1928, they were called Spartaciads. These games were conceived as something specifically proletarian, an answer to the nationalist Olympics.⁶ That meant that Spartacus, in contrast to Eunus or Salvius-Tryphon, became a part of the revolutionary mythology and martyrology of the Soviet Union. In spite of this advantage, he has suffered from the abrupt changes of course in Soviet historical writing and thinking.

We must be conscious of the fact that the question of 'periodization'* has always been a somewhat ticklish matter, even on occasion a dangerous one inside the Soviet Union.⁷ There are some grounds for this. Firstly, in the 30 years before 1956-60 it was virtually impossible to mention the names and works of those Russian historians who had either left Russia after the October Revolution and been actively opposed to the Soviet government, such as M. I. Rostovcev, or had stayed on in Russia and continued to work there, only to be forbidden later on to practice their profession, or were even exiled or murdered.⁸ Secondly, the first twelve years (from 1917-1929) were for all practical purposes totally under the shadow of M. N. Pokrovskij, who by and large founded and developed Soviet-Marxist historiography and its philosophy of history.⁹ Attacks on him and his contemporaries had already begun in 1929, yet when he died in 1932 he was buried with full honours,¹⁰ and Stalin, Molotov, Kalinin and other members of the Party Establishment were among the pall bearers at his funeral.¹¹ But in 1934, only two years after his death, all Hell broke loose, and for the next 25 years until his rehabilitation he was referred to, if at all, as 'Pokrovskij and his gang'.¹² That is why no satisfactory account of the development of Soviet historical writing in the 20s could be compiled. Thirdly, during the 20s, much effort was devoted to research into antiquity, to translating the works of Western ancient historians, in the main those of German scholars such as Karl Bücher, Robert von Pöhlmann, Max Weber and others. Yet the dependence of Soviet historical writers on foreign and particularly on German historians was unmentionable in the years from 1936-1955.¹³ Particularly between 1946 and 1955 a campaign was conducted against 'kow-towing to the West', and even today many Soviet historians prefer to see themselves as the apostles of a specific, self-sufficient form of historical writing, which was based, if not exclusively on Marxist-leninist principles, certainly on pre-revolutionary historical writing.¹⁴ It was only with the 'Thaw' after Stalin's death in 1953 and more obviously during the short 'Spring' of 1956-57 that people began to examine the past, to make a critical assessment of what were definite mistakes in the historical writing of former years,¹⁵ and to conduct a relatively civilized dialogue with their Western colleagues.¹⁶

* 'Periodization' (*Periodisierung*), in a Marxist sense, means the breaking down of the historical process into a number of 'periods'. The terms used for these subdivisions are 'epoch', 'period', 'etappe' and 'phase'. A good summary of the theory behind this is found in E. Engelberg *et al.* 1974, pp. 5-8. In our context 'periodization' means the division of the whole period of Soviet historical writing into smaller units (phases), as may be seen in Appendix A (*inf.* p. 23). The attempts made by some Soviet historians to 'pass over in silence' (*schweigend übergehen*) some rather unsavoury episodes, or to present an (untrue) picture of a steadily improving Soviet historiography, make the problem indeed explosive (*brisant*).

As already stated, in the Soviet Union the 20s were a time of struggle, but also one of co-existence between Marxist and non-Marxist scholars.¹⁷ The educated or interested reader could still get hold of E. I. Bogoljubov's monograph on Spartacus (Moscow, 1906),¹⁸ or even of Western literature on the subject in libraries.¹⁹ Lenin had personally declared himself in favour of the profitable use of the best to be got out of Western historians,²⁰ had, as was said, advanced this by the use of translations, and —what came to be attributed to him after 1929 as a guiding principle²¹— had brought *Partijnost* (i. e. 'empathy towards the Party') to bear only very sparingly, if at all, in the field of ancient history. What is '*Partijnost*'? Here it may be defined as a definite conception of historical events and an interpretation of them based on the class-consciousness of the Marxist historian.²² Lenin had asserted in 1895, arguing against the historian Struve, that if the inevitability of particular events were to be proved, the objectivist critic is always in danger of becoming an apologist for the facts. This was of course a criticism of objective writing of history,²³ but was sharpened in 1930 to the proposition: "Who is not for us is against us",²⁴ and in 1931 it went even further to the opinion: "If people in ancient Greece were hanged for being neutral [*sic!*], then,—*mutatis mutandis*— in the context of today they ought to be shot".²⁵ In relation to Spartacus' uprising, *Partijnost* meant an interpretation 'from below', as opposed to the prevalent one 'from on top'. Quite recently (in 1980) it was asserted that Lenin had shown a special interest in Spartacus' uprising, because he saw in it the most clear-cut example of the 'class-contradiction' between the two antagonistic classes of slave-owners and slaves, and had offered just such an explanation.²⁶ We are told that Lenin, by using the example of this struggle, had "analyzed in detail the characteristic features of the class-struggle on the part of the slaves and clarified for us the special nature of the intertwining of class and status in the class-ridden society of antiquity".²⁷ How far this assertion can be documented on the evidence of Lenin's writings remains an open question.

The first half of the 20s was also the time of the so-called 'vulgar marxism',²⁸ that is to say the time in which half-educated and half-trained historians, some of whom had fought in the civil war, wanted to read their own experiences into ancient history. They were especially interested in the Gracchi and Spartacus, in whom they fondly imagined that they were discovering their own precursors.²⁹ Their efforts were not only methodologically flawed, but also suffered from defective knowledge of the sources and from the erroneous impression that Roman society in the late Republic was a capitalist one in which the Gracchi or Spartacus had been leaders of the proletariat.³⁰ Against this view an ancient historian, A. I. Tjumenev, had somewhat earlier (1920-23) begun to develop a specifically Soviet-Marxist interpretation of Greek society. He rejected, rightly in my opinion, the 'modernizing' of the ancient social order (as had been done by e.g. Ed. Meyer or K. Bücher) and developed the now familiar concept of the slave-owning society and of the specific mode of

production in antiquity.³¹ This new perspective was transferred, not always very successfully, to Roman contexts by V. S. Sergeev and S. I. Kovalev. In the text-books which they wrote modernizing influences are so noticeable (as they are also in those of e.g. K. J. Beloch and Max Weber), that Sergeev and Kovalev had subsequently to revise their books. In Kovalev's case this was a matter of "having sincerely to acknowledge his errors".³² Since however there were no better text-books—in the Soviet view—to be had, several new editions appeared, which were accepted as teaching material in the Universities of the Soviet Union until the end of the 40s.³³ In these books Spartacus' uprising was characterized as a 'revolutionary movement' but the 'bearers of the revolution', that is to say the slaves, were lacking. They were seen as "men in whom the monolithic unity which might have welded them into a revolutionary class was not to be found".³⁴ The non-Marxist historian P. F. Preobraženskij, who met his death at the age of 47 after four years of imprisonment, expressed this view even more clearly: "Not only Spartacus' movement but also all the other cases of slave unrest as well lacked a positive programme." In fact at the time of the uprisings the slaves were never a class that stood on its own feet. On the political level they never advanced beyond a mere copy of the existing political order. For them in the socio-political sphere it was just "back to a system of small-holders" or "back to an agrarian village economy".³⁵ Although Preobraženskij had provided his book with plenty of quotations from Lenin, his writings were rejected on ideological grounds in the Soviet Union. Not until 1965 did S. D. Skazkina, a member of the Soviet Academy of Sciences, together with S. L. Utčenko, dare to assemble a selection of the writings which Preobraženskij had left behind and to publish them either afresh or for the first time. In the Introduction (p. 3) Mrs. E. M. Štaerman pointed to the 'tragic human fate' of the author, which "unfortunately led to his works being forgotten". Fifteen years later not only his name but also his works and his 'fate' are once more taboo.³⁶

At about the same time (1931) L. V. Baženov, a Marxist historian who was later to fall a victim to the purges, tried to make a critical examination of the concept of the slave-revolution. In his view its success would have had one of two consequences: either the existing order of slave-ownership would have been eliminated and there would have been a return to the previous social order, or the slaves would have themselves become slave-owners after their victory, that is to say, it would have resulted only in changes of personalities, not in changes to society. He did not himself make it clear which of these two possibilities he regarded as the more likely, but both were "conditional upon victory" and that was, according to Baženov (and Lenin) quite impossible in the situation as it was.³⁷ What offended official dogma a little later about Baženov's thesis is clear enough. Firstly, he had denied that the slave-uprising had been a class-conflict; secondly, he had opened up the possibility of a retrograde development of the social order, and this, although not intended as such, meant the possibility of a successful counter-revolution. Thirdly,

Baženov accepted, rightly in my opinion, that there was no slave-ideology, but only a 'romantic nostalgia on the part of the slaves', a hankering after the 'good old days'. Lacking a revolutionary ideology the slaves became, in Baženov's work, although not defined as such, in effect grudging 'dogs in the manger' (*Versager*), who wanted to take over the role of masters, and this meant, in an ideologically false sense, "slaves into masters, masters into slaves".

While the persecution of all those who considered themselves orthodox Marxist historians (*e. g.* Kovalev, Nedel'skij, Prigožin and Baženov) only began in the 30's,³⁸ the harrassing and elimination of 'loyal' bourgeois historians had already started at the beginning of the 20s. Co-existence between Marxist and bourgeois historians finally fell apart in 1925-26, when the Deputy Minister for Education for Universities at that time, M. N. Pokrovskij, founded the journal '*Istoričeskij Marxist*' ('*Marxist Historian*'). "Methodological problems", he wrote, "must stand at the very heart of this journal. We must declare war on bourgeois historians, and wage it by means of comparison of their methods with those of Marxists".³⁹ The trouble was that the struggle was conducted not merely "by means of comparison" of methods, but by sterner measures.⁴⁰ The new policy in regard to bourgeois historians was probably triggered off by the ideological and personal contentions for supremacy which were growing ever more intense after Lenin's death on 21 January 1924.⁴¹ But the Ancient History front—the word 'front' has overtones of war-time—was not yet at the centre of the interests of Stalin and his associates, and remained relatively quiet for that reason. Pokrovskij however was an extremist. As he was for all practical purposes the sole holder of power in the field of history, he would brook no opposition. In his view "history is, like every other branch of science, bound up with the scientist's social class".⁴² In his opinion "the past has not so much moulded the present as the present has given the past the form in which we perceive it".⁴³ This viewpoint crystallized into his famous dictum: "The past is today's politics projected onto the past".⁴⁴ (Here the unacknowledged influence of B. Croce on his views is worth noting). The practical result of this attitude was naturally a modernizing of Ancient History. Nevertheless the popular books on Spartacus which were written in this spirit (as *e. g.* those by A. Michailov and M. P. Putilovskij)⁴⁵ and made Spartacus out to be the ringleader of a revolution, could not survive critical inspection by a trained ancient historian. Perhaps that is why the Czech historian Jan Burian in his pioneer essay which appeared in 1960, (*Spartacus in Soviet Research*)⁴⁶ does not mention this kind of writing at all, while K. P. Korževa, in her essay which appeared in Russian in 1974 (German translation by Ronald Gielke, 1979) dismissed these attempts in a single short sentence.⁴⁷

In 1929 (not, *pace* Guarino,⁴⁸ 1930), that is five years after his death, the 'canonical' text of Lenin's book '*On the State*' appeared in its first edition. This is of the highest significance for our subject, since it is here for the first time that Lenin's analysis is to be found of the reasons for the failure of slave-uprisings in antiquity, which has remained a dogma for all Soviet

historians ever since.⁴⁹ Lenin's explanation runs: "the uprisings were unsuccessful because even in the most revolutionary crises of history the slaves were always the tools of the ruling classes".⁵⁰ Based on this book of Lenin, J. V. Stalin developed the thesis of the division of human history into five successive periods, defined on the basis of their social structure. [Translator's note: these are the so-called 'formations' referred to *passim* in what follows]. The Soviet ancient historian A. Korostovcev in 1942 assessed Stalin's contribution in these terms: "the genuinely marxist solution of J. V. Stalin has an enormous importance, as it has established the essence of historical development as a progressive replacement of five social systems in the most precise and clear fashion. He [Stalin] has thereby destroyed the cyclical interpretation of history".⁵¹ It should suffice to mention at this point that the recognition of Stalin's contributions to the philosophy of history survived him only for a short time.⁵² However from 19 February 1933 until the middle of the 50's every Soviet historian had to interpret the slave-uprisings with reference to Stalinist theory, according to which "the great slave-uprisings of the declining Roman republic annihilated the slave-owner class and the slave-owner society".⁵³

Although Stalin's words had an immediate effect in many cases,⁵⁴ the year 1934 was in the fullest sense "a turning point in research in Ancient History in general and in regard to the slave-wars in particular".⁵⁵ There were some reasons for this. Firstly, in 1930 History was abolished as a specific branch of learning. This decision rested on Pokrovskij's initiative, and he had declared for the primacy of the social sciences. In consequence History was degraded to one of the subordinate disciplines.⁵⁶ When afterwards in 1934 Pokrovskij himself, together with his theories and his school of followers, was discredited, historians including ancient historians, attempted a 'come-back' in which they sought to prove to the Party leadership that they too had their contribution to make to the 'ideological conflicts' of the day.⁵⁷ They seem to have been successful, since on 16 May 1934 the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the USSR and the Soviet government decided to reintroduce the study of History into secondary schools and Universities,⁵⁸ in order "to demonstrate concrete facts, not abstract patterns" (as had been the practice of Pokrovskij and his school).⁵⁹ The objective they had set themselves seems not to have been attained, since in 1964 two members of the Academy of Sciences repeated the warning: "historians should not limit themselves to the task of searching for fresh examples to illustrate well-established propositions".⁶⁰ Secondly, some time was needed, even in the Soviet Union, for incorporating Stalin's astonishing thesis into current research.⁶¹ The main difficulty was that the whole thesis rested on a defective knowledge of history, and was quite simply wrong. Spartacus' uprising ended in 71 BC, (in the most favourable case for Stalin's argument in 63 BC) and even in the Soviet Union no one would have taken seriously a date for the rise of feudalism earlier than the 5/6th century AD. Even in

the opinion of Soviet historians feudalism took shape at the earliest in the 9/10th century.⁶² That meant that between Spartacus and the downfall of the slave-owner system and its replacement by Feudalism lay a gap of at least 600 years. For this reason an explanation had to be found for the manner in which Spartacus' uprising could nevertheless have been the cause of the birth of Feudalism. To bridge these centuries, the theory of the two-phase or three-phase revolution was developed. This solution had a special attraction for the Party's ideologists, as there had been a multi-phase revolution in Russia (Decabrists; Narodniki; 1905; two revolutions in 1917). According to this scheme, Spartacus' uprising was "the last and most effective chapter in the history of the first phase",⁶³ roughly the counterpart in ancient history to 'the year 1905'.

A young and ambitious historian, A. V. Mišulin, took over the underpinning of this new interpretation;⁶⁴ he was to become one of the most widely known of Soviet historians. Born in 1901, he had been a Party member since 1927, and always "a protagonist of a progressive Soviet science of history and a fiery patriot".⁶⁵ In the terrible year 1937 he became co-editor with Ranovič of *Vestnik Drevnej Istorii* (*V. D. I.*), the only specialist periodical for the study of antiquity in the Soviet Union, in place of the first editor, A. S. Svanidze, who had disappeared in the course of the Purges.⁶⁶ Although Mišulin was only awarded his doctorate in 1943,⁶⁷ (and at that at the hands of a former pupil), since 1938 he had been Director of the Ancient History Section at the Historical Institute of the Academy of Sciences. It is hardly conceivable that his meteoric rise was entirely unconnected with his encomia on Stalin, which appeared in part as anonymous leading articles in *V. D. I.*⁶⁸ But there were enough toadies around, and the explanation must be sought elsewhere. Within three years Mišulin published three essays⁶⁹ and two books on the theme of Spartacus,⁷⁰ which means that his work had found responsive echoes in the places which mattered.⁷¹ Mišulin expressed his thanks to Spartacus for his meteoric career by naming his son Spartak, who is today a popular TV star in the Soviet Union. Thus Spartacus and Mišulin are from now on indissolubly linked.

We saw earlier (p. 4) that even before Mišulin L. V. Baženov had published a marxist-leninist interpretation of the uprising, which had not won approval. Mišulin saw Baženov's mistake very clearly, and for that reason fastened upon the first of his possibilities and adapted it to suit his own time and purpose. This is how he formulated it: "the struggle against the slave-owner system as such became clear at the end of the 2nd century BC. At that time, during Spartacus' uprising, the self-awareness of the slaves became strong enough for an attempt at self-liberation. This in its turn *might* [W. Z. R.'s italics] have caused the fall of the slave-owning system."⁷² The consequence of Spartacus' revolution (*sic!*) was that "the class of slave-owners, whose dominance had been undermined by the revolution, was now forced to accept an undisguised military dictatorship.

This intensified the class-struggle and led to a new revolution of slaves and peasants, which in the 4/5th centuries finally liquidated the slave-owner based economy".⁷³

In his interpretation Mišulin emphasized the ideological foundation, the mass-organization, which means in modern parallels, the Party. In order to transform Spartacus' uprising into a revolution, Mišulin used the current terminology, and stressed the participation of the peasants and landless free-men in the movement. That made the slave-leader Spartacus into the "herald of the first liberation movement in history", and—at this point Mišulin quotes Marx's words—into "the most genuine representative of the proletariat."⁷⁴ Just as in the Communist Party of the USSR the left-wing opposition (the Trotskyites) and the right-wing opponents (the Bucharin-Tomskij group) had hindered the Great Leader ('*Vožd*') in the execution of the plans conceived by his genius and sabotaged his actions, so too in Spartacus' uprising the 'extremists of the left' (Crixus and Oenomaus; Castus and Gannicus) and the 'petty bourgeois opposition' (*sc.* the poor freemen)⁷⁵ had hindered their Great Leader ('*Vožd*') Spartacus in carrying out his plans. Spartacus came to grief because of inadequate discipline and the splitting of his forces. Had he got rid of the opposition at the right moment, he would have had a chance of winning. From this it follows, according to empirical materialism, that the opposition must be relentlessly eliminated at the right moment, in order to save the revolution. So Mišulin, by the use of an example from ancient history, legitimized the elimination both of the Kulaks and of the opposition from within the Party. It should be noted that in the years between 1929 and 1945 Alexsej Tolstoj wrote his novel 'Peter the Great' with a similar aim,⁷⁶ and also that the monographs of S. B. Veselovskij⁷⁵ and S. V. Bakhrušin⁷⁸ on Ivan IV ('The Terrible') contain obvious modern allusions.⁷⁹ After Stalin's death a member of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, A. S. Sidorov, admitted quite openly that "we [Soviet historians] uphold the position that in the solving of modern problems the lessons of history must be turned to account".⁸⁰

All would have been neat and tidy, but the great trouble with Mišulin's essays and his book on Spartacus of 1936⁸¹ was the sketchy knowledge of facts shown in them. The works of the years 1934-35 were, despite their ideological appeal, full of errors, even on dates. For this reason Mišulin hastened to publish two new revisions. Two reviews appeared in the USSR, by G. Sergievskij⁸² and P. F. Preobraženskij.⁸³ The writing of reviews of this kind could have fatal consequences;⁸⁴ both reviewers disappeared, Preobraženskij in 1937 and Sergievskij in 1938. The very title of Sergievskij's review shows that he was aware of the danger of writing it: it is subtitled "a valuable but immature work on slave-uprisings". It begins with these words: "To meet the author's wish, I shall try to point out the advantages and defects of his work, because it must be revised".⁸⁵ That means that from one point of view Sergievskij

was conscious of the danger of criticizing the book, yet as a learned man he saw that it needed a scholarly re-working and as a marxist historian he contested Mišulin's thesis on doctrinal grounds. He criticized Mišulin's assertion that Greco-Roman antiquity had been the first class-society, just as he disputed the division of that society into "two categories sharply opposed to each other", those of the free citizenry (by which he meant the present and future slave-owners) and the mass of the slaves, the producers in the fields, those engaged in trade and in domestic employment. He also rejected Mišulin's assertion that there was no difference in the position of slaves working in different professions.⁸⁶ Without pursuing the battle of quotations (from Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin, rather than from the sources), Sergievskij was right—and this would be accepted today even in the Soviet Union⁸⁷—in maintaining against Mišulin that in the first century BC many Romans were themselves still workers, and, among other occupations, on the land.⁸⁸ Sergievskij goes further: "enchanted with his attempt to sketch the fullest possible picture of the class-struggle between the oppressed and their oppressors, Comrade Mišulin goes in some cases further than the sources allow, and by presenting what he wants to find as what is actually in the sources, discovers slave-uprisings where it is still too early to speak of them".⁸⁹ Furthermore, on Spartacus' side there was no programme for nationalizing or collectivizing the land, as Mišulin had thought. "For Mišulin"—Sergievskij goes on—"the Italian peasants were degraded to mere 'followers'".⁹⁰ But on this point Mišulin had more clearly recognized the wishes of the Party. For the truth is that Marx and Stalin hated, despised and feared the peasants.⁹¹ The annihilation of the peasantry, the Kulaks, during the process of collectivization from 1128 till 1934 was carried out at Stalin's wish, although thereby—even until today—the Soviet rural economy has been ruined.⁹² Mainly, it seems, thanks to his ideological purity Mišulin has remained ever since the authority on Spartacus in the Soviet Union, although K. P. Korževa in 1974 admits that "there are some statements in Mišulin's writings which appear questionable. Nevertheless, in spite of all, his monograph is the best historical treatment of Spartacus which has appeared either in the USSR or abroad".⁹³

A good example of publications which have come to be written under the frankly admitted influence of Mišulin is that of D. Peters, of the year 1940.⁹⁴ It is only worth mentioning because of its strong emphasis on the 'Vožd-cult'. Peters begins with the general assertion: "the history of human society knows of many cases where the recollection of personalities and leaders ('Voždi') of the oppressed and exploited masses has been preserved over millennia, from generation to generation." Peters then drew, wrongly, parallels with Lenin, Čapaev and Šcors, while omitting Stalin.⁹⁵ The section on the personality of Spartacus opens with the words: "the personality of the *Vožd*' plays a great part in every revolutionary movement",⁹⁶—yet another instance of personality cult. His choice of wording "in order to protect the army of the insurgents from

spies...Spartacus only accepted deserters after a preliminary examination"⁹⁷ is typical of the spy-mania current in the Soviet Union at the time, and gives a Soviet ring to Appian (*Bell. Civ.* I. 117) *αὐτομόλων τε πολλῶν αὐτῷ προσιόντων οὐδένα προσέετο*. But, in contrast to Mišulin, Peters remained loyal to Leninist doctrine to the end, and sketched the uprising not indeed as a 'class-struggle in antiquity' but as 'one of the greatest slave-uprisings', not however as a 'revolution of the slaves'.⁹⁸

A more successful attack on Mišulin's position came somewhat unexpectedly from S. I. Kovalev (1886-1960). Kovalev had begun his studies in history before the Revolution, but only completed them in 1922. He had taken part in the Civil War on the side of the Reds, and stayed on in the Red Army until 1938. Although he too, as we saw (p. 4 and n. 31), had been vigorously criticized ("the pseudo-historian Kovalev") and 'repressed', he was one of the few lucky ones who were released from prison before the outbreak of the 'Great Patriotic War', and returned to academic life.⁹⁹ This attack from Kovalev was quite unexpected, because he should have been cautious in view of his personal experiences, and as one of the most substantial representatives of the theory of the "two-phase revolution in Antiquity" might not have seemed *prima facie* the right candidate for such an undertaking. His attack was published in 1947,¹⁰⁰ at the most vicious time of the 'Personality Cult', of Greater Russian chauvinism, and of "the struggle against the 'homeless cosmopolitans'", that is to say the Jews.¹⁰¹ It was a time when the primacy of Russian achievements in every field of scientific activity had to be asserted, even it that meant the rehabilitation of pre-Revolutionary Russian historians.¹⁰² It may have been an early volley of the arch-conservatives against the Zhdanovites, though A. V. Mišulin fell from power as Rector of the Academy of Sciences only in September 1948. Kovalev began this part of his essay with the obligatory attack on bourgeois historians. Then came the no less obligatory expression of thanks to Comrade Stalin, "whose speeches gave the impulse which forced Soviet historians to revise their opinions on revolutions in Antiquity". Kovalev himself retracted his incorrect scheme of 1933 "which had been adopted by many historians of antiquity" and offered "a new analysis of the problem".¹⁰³

According to Kovalev, the mistake of Mišulin, and of others too, amounted to their having only regarded Stalin's words of 19 February 1933 and not taken sufficient account of the clarification of 26 January 1934, according to which it happened that the non-Romans, that is to say all 'barbarians', united against the common enemy and overthrew Rome with a loud crash". [Note by W. Z. R.: I find difficulty in reproducing accurately the tone of the crude language of Stalin, and it is not clear how he came by this remarkable idea of 'united barbarians'.¹⁰⁴] According to Kovalev's new interpretation, the uprising of Spartacus was not a part of the revolution which effected the transition from slave-owner society to feudalism, but merely one of those "sporadic outbreaks of revolutionary

movements which were separated from each other by long intervals".¹⁰⁵ "For if we try to establish what marxism-leninism understands by a social revolution, I think that it has four recognition signs:

- (1) Change in the means of production.
- (2) The existence of a 'dominant class'.
- (3) An armed insurrection.
- (4) The seizure of political power, or, as Lenin put it, the power of the state passes from one class into the hands of another".¹⁰⁶

Kovalev pointed to the fact that Spartacus' uprising effected no change in the modes of production, and could not have had that effect even in the imaginary situation of the success of the uprising. Furthermore in the 2/1st century BC there was no class that could have exercised the function of leadership: "if we speak of a dominant class, we mean a class which can lead the other classes, as *e. g.* the proletariat leads the peasants. But", Kovalev went on, "K. Marx, the greatest (*sic!*) of ancient historians, asserted that the history of the Roman republic must be treated as a confrontation between the big landowners and the small peasantry, and in that the slaves played only a very minor part".¹⁰⁷

So, with Marx's help, Kovalev was able once again to wrest from the slaves the role of leader, which had been conferred on them by Mišulin. The second main constituent of Spartacus' army was, on Mišulin's theory, the shepherds, the small peasantry and the landless agricultural labourers. Here Kovalev made use of Stalin's mistrust and dislike of the peasants, and wrote: "It is generally known that it was the lack of coherent discipline which made them (*sc.* the peasants) unfit for the part of a leading class", ¹⁰⁸ while the free poor in Rome were a *Lumpenproletariat*, and not a class-conscious class which could have conducted a systematic and organized struggle. Thus there was no class which could have seized political power, and that is why things only came to 'revolutionary outbreaks', never to a 'revolution'. The difference was not merely a semantic one in the presentation of the concept "revolutionary outbreak = failure" in contrast to "revolution = success", but lay in the essence of the phenomenon. An outbreak is elementally upwelling (or "goes by fits and starts") (Germ. *stychisch*, Russian *стихийное*), shapeless and in the nature of things negative; a revolution is historically conditioned, well organized and marches with a confident stride towards a happy future.*

* According to Demidov (1984, pp. 18 ff.): '*Stichijnost*' is a word much used in Russian colloquial and scientific language. It expresses 'spontaneity' in a *social* sense, being applied to events which are unorganized, unregulated or develop without leadership. English, French and Italian lack this additional overtone of their equivalent words for 'spontaneous', and use them (wrongly) to render *stichijnij*. He denies (pp. 20-4) a marxist-leninist rejection of *stichijnost* in the revolutionary process, and states that *stichijnost* and consciousness are stages in the growth of the revolutionary process (ibid. p. 24). But as Batalov (1983, pp. 37, 83 ff.) stresses repeatedly, Lenin insisted that a "definite level of consciousness and a certain degree of organization are essential for

We know that Stalin forbade, both in literature and in historical writing, any description of the partizan movements in the Second World War as 'stychisch' (elementally upwelling),—as other than conducted and organized by the Party,—as illustrated from the enforced revisions of A. A. Fadeev's novel *The Young Guard*.¹⁰⁹ In so far as the army of Spartacus could be described as "elementally upwelling, ill-organized, undisciplined and resting on an initiative from below", it aroused Stalin's mistrust.¹¹⁰ One positive success for Kovalev was a correct date for the uprising of Spartacus (73-71 BC) and also for the transition to feudalism.

Among those¹¹¹ who carried further the destruction of the dominance of Mišulin's conception was S. L. Utčenko.¹¹² He has created for himself in the West since 1956 a name for being a liberal historian persecuted by the regime, and his charming man-of-the-world behaviour [which is not without obvious parallels in more recent times in the USSR: J. G. G's note] made it hard even for the younger Soviet historians to believe that this same Utčenko, although himself half-Jewish, had been at the end of the 40s one of the keenest instigators in the Historical Institute of the attack on the 'homeless cosmopolitans'. He was not only a Party member, but was for years on end a member or secretary of the Party organization of his Institute, even in the 60s.¹¹³ With such a record, he could allow himself some latitude. In his preface to Mišulin's book on Spartacus of 1947, the uprising was yet another "consciously revolutionary insurrection of an oppressed class" and "the first impulse which set in motion the slow-growing and gathering forces of revolution"...and administered the "strongest revolutionary shock to the foundations of the slave-owner system".¹¹⁴ That was also good Stalinist theory, without Stalin being expressly cited. *Ars est celare artem*. Yet already in an essay printed in 1951 as a 'discussion paper' Utčenko had gone over to a concept of the multiplicity of class-distinctions between two historically antagonistic social orders, those of slaves and slave-owners, but Utčenko pointed also to the distinction between class and status in antiquity, which lent the struggle an unmistakably antique colour.¹¹⁵

It only needed a favourable political climate to give Utčenko the chance of acknowledging what he had always been all too conscious of, that in point of fact not only the free elements but also "the class of slaves in Rome of the period of the full flowering of the slave-owner system had not been a unified and undifferentiated class".¹¹⁶ It would appear that Utčenko himself had suffered severely from "the hypnotic effect of Stalin's

success", as also is the timing. "Violence is the 'midwife of history'; it yields the expected result only if the fruit is in the main ripe; otherwise the result may even be the opposite" (p. 63). The topical nature of *stichijnost'* underlies Rosa Luxemburg's disagreements with Lenin, and also the present-day ideological disputes between the Soviets and, e. g. Che Guevara or the New Left; cf. Demidov (1984, pp. 62-67).

well-known formula about the 'slave revolution'", since this phrase occurs three times in one of his books,¹¹⁷ and again, without mention of Stalin's name, in the works of 1969 and 1972.¹¹⁸ Utčenko may have regretted having prematurely attacked the 'Vožd', who was now slowly regaining respectability, when it would have been safer to lay the blame for the thesis of the 'slave-revolution' at the doors of the historians Mišulin and, in particular, Kovalev. While in his essay which came out in 1951 Spartacus' uprising still led to "the consolidation of the ruling class, which right up to the establishment of a military dictatorship and a coming to terms of the various social groups and strata"¹¹⁹ (*sc.* of the free elements against the slaves), in 1965 he rejected this idea as "absolutely unacceptable".¹²⁰ His conclusion was: "the alliance of free men and slaves was never anything other than that of horse and rider", that is to say: "both...lines of the socio-political struggle—that of plebeian peasants and slaves—could in no circumstances fuse into one. That was conditioned by the whole logic, character and level of development of the class-struggle in the Roman slave-owner society."¹²¹ Thus in Utčenko's work Mišulin's main thesis was discarded ever more decisively in the course of time, as being 'unmarxist' and 'unleninist'. In combating Kovalev and Maškin, Utčenko accepted the proposition that one "can speak of the revolutionary character of the transition from Republic to Principate". The concept of revolution can be applied to the movement of the Gracchi up to the Social War. For Utčenko this, and not the uprising of Spartacus, was the 'highest stage'¹²² of the Roman Revolution. Thereby the Italian peasants, not the slaves, became the prime-movers of the revolution, which came to its end before the uprising of Spartacus, as we can see from his chronological subdivision (*Periodisierung*) of the Revolution: "in this sense the Roman Revolution of the 2/1 centuries BC had its Thermidor (in Sulla's Revolution), its 18th Brumaire (in Caesar's dictatorship), and at the end a long-lasting and stable Restoration (in Augustus' Principate)".¹²³ Although sound Marxism, Utčenko's new thesis has not won general acceptance in the Soviet Union.¹²⁴

Utčenko's example points to the influence of the Twentieth Party Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union on Soviet historical thinking. Mikoyan began his attack on Stalin and the personality-cult on 16 February 1956, and Chruščev carried it further at a closed sitting on 24-25th about a week later (24-25th).¹²⁵ The effect of the new party-line is to be seen at its clearest by a comparison of two works by Mrs. E. M. Štaerman, which appeared in quick succession in the course of the two crucial months, January-February, 1956. In an essay sent to the printer in January she wrote in strictly conventional terms: "the uprising of Spartacus had an enormous significance for Roman history and the slave-owner system as a whole. It showed that the Republic was no longer in a position to guarantee the interests of the slave-owners. Only a military dictatorship could do that".¹²⁶ In the other study, handed to the printer

in February of that year, in the second volume of the large-scale *World History* for which Utčenko was responsible as Editor-in-Chief, we find her offering a quite different formulation: "The uprising of Spartacus showed that the slaves had not yet become a class which could have brought about a change in the mode of production. They only wanted to free themselves, not to do away with slavery and found a new society. For this reason they were unable to formulate any ideology which would have united all the oppressed".¹²⁷ Thus Mrs Štaerman hinted that the slaves could never be a leading class in a revolution, let alone make the transition from Republic to military dictatorship necessary. At that time all Soviet text-books were still speaking of Spartacus' uprising as "a terrible blow, from which the slave-owner society never recovered", or of "a tactical failure,¹²⁸ but a great moral victory", formulations which are entirely suited to Stalinist thinking.

The Twentieth Party Congress was naturally a joyful, if also rather traumatic turning-point, and not only for Mrs. Štaerman but for all other Soviet historians as well.¹²⁹ The historian A. M. Nekrič, now working in the West, in his autobiography which bears the suggestive title 'Renounce Fear' (*Lossagen von der Furcht*),¹³⁰ has given an excellent description of the expectations which this occasion aroused, as well as of the circumstances and reasons for its all-too-sudden disappointment. The Party demanded of historians "research into the achievements of the masses, the elimination of the after-effects of the Personality-cult [*i. e.* the Stalin-cult; W. Z. R.], a concerted struggle against dogmatism, formalism and the 'craze for quotations'".¹³¹ In practical terms this required a heightened intellectual level and knowledge of the ancient languages,¹³² the sources and the state of modern research.¹³³ It was the solution expounded by Chruščev in other areas: "to draw level with America (or the West) and overtake it". It was urged upon ancient historians that they should tackle not only general and theoretical questions, but specific ones as well. To be able to fulfill these requirements, historians demanded as a kind of *quid pro quo* the advancement of the training of young experts, who, given free access to the publications of Western colleagues and by exchange of books and ideas as a result of wide participation in symposia and international conferences, would obtain the resources they needed.¹³⁴ The unrest which was provoked by the outcome of the Twentieth Party Congress and the freeing of millions from prison camps, was not confined to historians. As early as October 1256 Chruščev was forced to give way and *inter alia* to clarify the limits of liberalization in the writing and interpretation of history.¹³⁵ In a Decree of 7th March 1957 the CP of the USSR attacked the periodical *Voprosy Istorii* ('Questions of History'); 'bourgeois objectivity' in the writing of history was emphatically rejected. In its place 'true scientific objectivity' was demanded, which means "loyalty to the principles of Marxism and Leninism, as defined by the Party".¹³⁶

Although the primacy of the Party in the interpretation of history was thus never called in question, much was changed in research into Spartacus. The works of Mrs. Maria Sergeenko¹³⁷ and V. I. Kuziščîn¹³⁸ contributed a great deal to the change in the treatment of Spartacus' uprising. These works were concerned, in accordance with the new guidelines, with a specific subject, rural economy in ancient Italy. Mrs. Sergeenko had been working for several decades on such questions, and it is unlikely that she harboured 'subversive aims', since she began her book with an attack on non-soviet historians.¹³⁹ But in her works, which were written with more attention to detail than insight, she came to the firm belief that in the time of the Great Slave Uprisings in Italy (which means the second and first centuries BC) there had been no shift to a more specialized single-crop agriculture (olives, wine, pasture-land etc.), and furthermore that there were still significant numbers of small peasants who managed their land with the help of seasonal hired-labour or even that of their own families.¹⁴⁰ Kuziščîn too, who developed more and more into an 'orthodox' historian, came to similar conclusions. In his latest book he wrote, in quite a different strain from his earlier ones: "the first *latifundia* appeared in Italy even before the first century BC, but in the 2/1st centuries BC they were isolated phenomena, with only a minimal importance for the economy as a whole".¹⁴¹ The result was unequivocal: the time of the slave-uprisings was the 'golden age' of Italian rural economy.¹⁴² As soon as one based oneself on detailed investigations of the ancient sources and not on modern generalizations, it became clear that the theory of the widely-diffused *latifundia*-system, with vast domains all over Italy populated and worked by slaves, did not fit the time of Spartacus' uprising.¹⁴³ Thus the grounds for the outbreak of the uprising, its scale, the composition of its army and the reasons for disunity within it, and its objectives as well as its influence on the history of its time had all to be investigated afresh. It was not enough to deny that Spartacus' uprising had been the beginning or the cause of the Roman Revolution; an alternative explanation was called for.¹⁴⁴

Thanks to her work on slavery in antiquity, Mrs. E. M. Štaerman would have been the Soviet historian from whom one would have expected a new doctrine about Spartacus' uprising. Unhappily her approach did not fit the orthodox marxist-leninist dogmas at all well. As far back as 1957, she had pointed in her book to the fact that the Roman sources for the time of Spartacus' uprising had no special interest for slavery and the danger it constituted for the ruling classes.¹⁴⁵ That was quite different from her statement on the after-effects of the uprising, which she had published a year earlier (see p. 13). In her book of 1964 (translated into German in 1969), she made a critical contrast between Soviet research and a small selection of Western literature. Her factual, academic tone towards J. Vogt, J. P. Brisson and others is quite new. Apparently she sides with O. O. Kruger over the aims of Spartacus' rising, when she writes: "the objectives of the insurgent slaves

generally depended upon their circumstances before their enslavement. The prisoner-of-war wanted to get back home, the debtor wanted his land back, while anyone born into slavery wanted to become free and perhaps also to change the structure of society". Thus she obviously rejected Spartacus as a protagonist of the abolition of the institution of slavery or as a destroyer of Rome.¹⁴⁶ In the last part of the passage quoted she states: "the influence of Spartacus' uprising on changes in the economic life of [of Rome] has apparently been overestimated [by Soviet researchers]", and further on: "it emerges that the colonate can not be a result of the uprising, since it had existed as long as Rome itself. Colonnate in place of slave-labour only became significant in the 2nd century AD".¹⁴⁷ Here it is fully accepted that the uprising belongs to the time of the full flowering of the Roman slave-owner society, not to its time of crisis. In her latest book on the subject published in 1978 she gives special prominence to the peculiarity of the 'class-struggle of the slaves', and rightly abandons any attempt to draw a parallel between revolution and change of the mode of production in antiquity and in modern times.¹⁴⁸

Apparently only Mrs. S. R. Kim¹⁴⁹ has gone beyond Mrs. Štaerman in the assessment of the special character of the class-struggle in antiquity. Following Štaerman, she asserted that from the end of the Republic "a gradual languishing of slavery began, through the transformation and changes of the most important mutually-opposed classes, those of masters and slaves".¹⁵⁰ So Kim speaks of an 'evolutionarily conditioned transition'—not a revolutionarily conditioned one—from one mode of production to another. She dates the start of this process to the 1st century BC, but it was not initiated by Spartacus' uprising: "no one got rid of slavery. It vanished as the result of evolution in the opposite direction, from within slavery itself, which dissolved itself. One of the most important reasons for the dying out and extinction of slavery were psychological changes in the mentality of the masters, in the way in which they felt towards slavery during the time of the decline of the Republic, when it came to be seen that the old methods of exploitation no longer paid their way".¹⁵¹ A psychological explanation for an economic decision diverges fundamentally from the usual Soviet explanations.¹⁵²

The writings of Štaerman and others on slavery in antiquity formed part of a series of works of the 'Seven Year Plan of the Historical Institute of the Soviet Academy of Sciences'.¹⁵³ The subjects for research had been—and in fact continue to be—laid down by the Party, and reflect the political interests of those who set these tasks at any given time.¹⁵⁴ Such dependence of research into Spartacus on modern political considerations indicates that interest in revolutions of this kind has not been very great since 1958, since only a few works have been published up to the time of writing, including those by Mrs. Turkina and Mrs. Korževa,¹⁵⁵ both of which really belong to the genre of historiography.¹⁵⁶ To these there must be added mentions in text-books and works of reference. But the substance is more important than the quantity. The new picture

of Spartacus by the ever-cautious, loyal Utčenko is interesting for the background to this distancing of the Party from Spartacus. He summarized his view thus: "Today we retract our thesis of a slave-revolution. Nevertheless we give expression to our agreement with Soviet historians, who emphasized the revolutionary character of these struggles [*i. e.* the slave-uprisings]. The ideological element of this struggle must not be overestimated...everything points to the elementally upwelling (*sty-chisch*) nature of the movement...thus the fairly wide-spread opinion must be revised, according to which...Spartacus' uprising was the main cause of the transition from Republic to Principate. This conception seems to us [now—*addition by W. Ž. R.*] completely unacceptable, mainly because it can only be maintained with much trouble and forced violation of the facts of history. It is quite impossible to speak of a consolidation of the ruling class..."¹⁵⁷ "Yet", so Utčenko concludes, "in the slave-uprising led by Spartacus there is, quite apart from its interest for regional history, something else, something eternal, involving our common humanity, and—let there be no fear of the word—something of value for world-history. In our view there came to be expressed in it the fact that in this great movement the oppressed and the outlawed—it may have been elementally upwelling, without a programme, it may not even have been directed against slavery as such—girded themselves for battle for the acquisition by conquest and the winning by force of the simplest and greatest of ideals for our common humanity in all ages,—*freedom*. [The last word is emphasized in italic type in the original]. In this youthful, naive, elementally upwelling and violent thrust for freedom rests the ever-widening meaning of Spartacus' uprising, the secret of thankful recollection of his successors right down to our own day".¹⁵⁸ I have felt compelled to give this lengthy quotation to show in high relief what is uncongenial to the gerontocratic regime of the USSR. Utčenko is hinting that Soviet historians falsify facts in order to be doctrinally correct. An 'unconsolidated' ruling class stands by implication in contrast to the class-opposition of 'slave—free'. The movement was indeed "elementally upwelling, naive, youthful and unruly", something for which elderly Soviet statesmen have little sympathy or affection.* The connection of thought and the language seem to me to point to Utčenko's having made Spartacus into a symbol of freedom for the individual. This is similar to the appeals made by the dissidents, only more prudently formulated.

In 1958 P. Karyskovskij's small book *The Uprising of Spartacus* was reissued, on the same scale as the first impression of 1956. It was a popularizing publication, without notes or critical examination of earlier works on the same subject, but with plenty of quotations from the works of Marx and Lenin. What is unusual about Karyskovskij is his view that one has to deal with a pure slave-uprising, in which "frequent cases of rape, arson and violence... had as a consequence that many dwellers in

* [Author's note: this sentence was written before the death of Černenko and the rise of M. Gorbačev]

small populated localities, as soon as they heard from their neighbours that slaves on the loose were approaching, vanished into the nearby hills as hastily as possible, with everything they possessed".¹⁵⁹ This is a paraphrase of a heavily restored fragment of Sallust (*Hist. fr.* 11b, 11d, Kurfess), but the author is not mentioned. The opinion voiced here is so like that of Mommsen that it is mentioned with horror in the Soviet Union.¹⁶⁰ Karyskovskij had not however completely freed himself from Stalinist dogma, when he writes in his summary: "the Roman slave-owners did not forget it [the uprising] for a very long time, and when after more than 400 years the waves of slave-uprisings, this time in common with other groups of oppressed people...and the onslaughts of tribes on the frontiers together with them...etc. etc."¹⁶¹ Karyskovskij summed up the uprising in the spirit of a loyalist patriot, and sees in the Spartaciads 'the best memorial to Spartacus'.¹⁶²

In 1981 K. A. Revjako published an article in which he promised to deal with slave-uprisings from the fifth to the first centuries BC. Quite reasonably he avoids going into details about the 'Bellum Spartiacum' (which he misdates to 74-71 BC), on the ground that "it has been sufficiently dealt with in Soviet and foreign historiography" (p. 112). I am however completely at a loss to understand why any Editor who knew his job should ever have seen fit to publish such an article. Much of this contribution is taken up with an undistinguished recapitulation of slave-uprisings of the years 419-187 BC, together with a table of events (p. 111). It is full of incorrect citations of documents which the writer seems not to have troubled to look up; he appears to be blissfully unaware of recent scholarly writing on the subject, and his understanding of the latest Soviet scholarship is equally unsatisfactory, reverting in places to views rejected by his betters inside the Soviet Union. I relegate to the decent obscurity of a footnote two of many examples of his glaring incompetence, which is only of interest in so far as it may serve as a warning to others.*

The essays of M. M. Slonimskij, Veickivskij and V. Gorskov are concerned with specific questions of the uprising. Slonimskij gives a summary of an article by R. Kamienik, which appeared in German in East Germany.¹⁶³ Apparently he accepted Kamienik's view that Mišulin had seriously overestimated the number of Spartacus' followers as well as

* Thus, to take only obvious examples, he wrongly cites (in his n. 20) *C. I. L.* I. 460 (he means *C. I. L.* I², 1. 638) and states that "a preserved inscription bears witness to the consul Publius Popilius of the year 132 BC, who as a praetor in Sicily 'recovered fugitivi from Italy and returned 917 of them'". He could not have looked up this inscription, the authorship of which is a matter of doubt. He further asserts (p. 107) that "the Roman slave-owning Republic was undermined to its foundations by slave-uprisings", and repeats this assumption in his summing-up (p. 112): after citing Lenin, he goes on: "in the evolution of the class-struggle the part of the slave-uprisings was especially significant...the ruling class was forced to establish a new form of government—the Empire." [he means the Principate]. *Sed hactenus haec.*

the casualties the Romans suffered.¹⁶⁴ Such an attempt to scale down the uprising to its likely proportions formed the basis of a more accurate view of the late Republic. Veickivskij's contribution (1973) to the topic was published in three instalments, but in the wrong order, the one on the sources being the last to appear. The author has evidently gone to a great deal of trouble to obtain nineteenth-century German research work on Spartacus. The results however are only remarkable in so far as it is unusual in the Soviet Union to find research undertaken so conscientiously. The language (White-Russian) and the difficulty of access to this book will preclude wider knowledge of it, even inside the Soviet Union.¹⁶⁵ Gorskov occupied himself with the military aspects of the uprising. For him Crassus is: 'an intelligent general who aimed at great success with little bloodshed'.¹⁶⁵ The significance of the uprising for the Romans lay partly in the fact that Spartacus preceded Julius Caesar and caused several improvements in the Roman conduct of warfare.¹⁶⁶ The doctrine of 'minimal bloodshed' is a controversial topic in the Soviet Union, since Stalin was criticized by some military men on the ground that his strategy in the Second World War required too much unnecessary sacrifice.¹⁶⁷ Have we here a veiled attack on definite military concepts and a hint to the top levels of the Party Establishment that they should steer clear of military decisions?

* * * * *

"For a woman historian" said Saburov reflectively, "as indeed for a man, it is not a simple matter to find a place today. History is a political battlefield. Everybody tries to exploit it for his own purposes". These words of a 'positive' character in a novel by the Stalinist writer V. Kočetov of the year 1967 state the official view of history and its tasks.¹⁶⁸ The close connection between research in Ancient History and its control by the Party or the setting of tasks to it by the Party is openly admitted, as it is, for instance, here: "the performance and achievement of Soviet...Ancient History would have been impossible without continual alertness on the part of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the USSR. In a series of special Decrees it has drawn the attention of Soviet scholars to the working out of highly topical problems, both theoretical and practical, in the social sciences, and thereby pointed out that its basis must be marxist-leninist, and that the sharpest possible attention to the principles of class-conditioned party-oriented attitudes and of their concrete historical presentation must be devoted to social phenomena".¹⁶⁹ For this reason, when¹⁷⁰ the curb-rein was tightened in the Soviet Union after the events of 1968, Ancient History also had its job to do, as, for instance, stated here: "the working out in depth of fundamental problems of the world-historical process: the origin, development and collapse of slave-ownership in various geographical areas, the distinctive features of class-structure and determination of status and the closely-linked struggles over class and status".¹⁶⁹ The old formula

of the class-struggle and the 'social revolution'¹⁷¹ is supplemented by a newer, more refined and historically more correct posing of the question which has been approved by the Party.¹⁷² But the new scholarly discoveries of Utčenko, Štaerman¹⁷² and others have not so far, it appears, cut any ice in textbooks, encyclopaedias and works of reference¹⁷⁴, although, for example, in 1968 V. N. Nikoforov in *S. I. E. (Soviet Historical Encyclopaedia)* had criticized the oversimplified conceptions of the 40's and 50's.¹⁷⁵ In 1971 Kuziščin had described Spartacus' army as a combination of slaves and free tenant-farmers; the free men were thus differentiated and not a unified class. By 1983 he had changed his mind on this and on other matters. He now believes the number of free participants, and their influence, to have been negligible.¹⁷⁶ The article and the uprising were summarized thus: "Spartacus' uprising had a tremendous influence on the end of the Roman Republic. Shocked by its scale, the slave-owners tightened the supervision of their slaves, came to prefer home-born slaves to prisoners-of-war and made over their custody to the state. Spartacus accelerated the coming of the Principate, as the slave-owners grasped the fact that it needed a strong government to suppress slave-uprisings".¹⁷⁷ Kuziščin rejects out of hand the thesis of a multi-stage revolution, but takes the uprising to be "one of the most sharply delineated symptoms of the class-struggle at the end of the Republic".¹⁷⁸ In his formulation he returns to Mišulin and more especially to Maškin.¹⁷⁹ The 'strong government' which maintains the *status quo* corresponds to the Soviet attitude towards Czechoslovakia and, within the Soviet Union, towards dissidents, artists and others after 1968. The strong emphasis on the personality of Spartacus in Kuziščin's contribution of 1983 is rather disconcerting, as it reflects the 'personality cult' of the later Brežnev era and accords with a lamentable tendency to review Stalin's part in Soviet history favourably.¹⁸⁰ An instructive example of untruthful thinly-veiled modernizing is offered by Korževa, whose summary tries to create the impression that she adheres to Utčenko: "even when one takes account of the elementally upwelling nature of Spartacus' uprising, as well as of the absence of planning and of the fact that there were probably differences of opinion on tactical and other matters within it, it was, in spite of all, one of the first and greatest examples of a revolutionary struggle for the dearest and most sacred of all ideals of all times, the cause of freedom".¹⁸¹ Everybody at all familiar with the convoluted language of a leading article in *Pravda* will recognize it immediately in Korževa's terminology and phrasing.

Let us now attempt to summarize briefly the problem of *Periodisierung* in Soviet research in Ancient History. (See Appendix A, *inf.*) It differs from that of modern and contemporary history to some extent, among other reasons because until 1934 only scanty ideological significance had been attached to it. The key-point of the measures of the Soviet regime in the area of education, including teaching and research in Universities, had

initially lain in gaining control over elementary school education.¹⁸² Thereafter it was a matter of training a technological *élite*, 'whose instruction had to be suited to the needs of the state'.¹⁸³ Since the mid-20's and the setting up of bodies such as the 'Institute of Red Professors', the 'Society of Marxist Historians', and the 'Historical Institute of the Communist Academy', which were founded by M. N. Pokrovskij in 1921, 1925 and 1929, and directed by him, the most important task at that time was to overcome problems in the interpretation of modern Russian history and the Bolshevik Revolution.¹⁸⁴ Although the new generation of 'revolutionary' students had no confidence in the 'old professors',¹⁸⁵ 'new' ancient historians could not be found quickly enough.¹⁸⁶ When furthermore in the 20's, as said earlier, attempts at a marxist re-interpretation of Ancient History were made, it was, in my judgment, the defective knowledge of language and of the sources—a handicap still not fully overcome—which hindered a thorough-going treatment from the side of the 'new specialists', who even in the Soviet Union fell into disrepute later as being 'vulgar marxists'. Even 'patriotic' elderly Professors found it difficult to do justice to the new demands made on them, as can be seen from the example of Zebelev.¹⁸⁷ Apart from this, history had been abolished as a specialist subject of instruction in schools, and been reduced to forming part of Social Science,¹⁸⁸ for the Classical Gymnasium and even the study of the Classical languages had been regarded as 'reactionary'.¹⁸⁹ Since the mid-20's the text-book edited by I. I. Minc had been used in the social sciences, and it begins with the history of the Middle Ages.¹⁹⁰ In the Universities literature translated or composed by 'old' professors was mainly used.¹⁹¹

The intensified control of history by the Party after 1927, and attacks on 'bourgeois' historians by Pokrovskij and his protégés only served to bewilder historians of antiquity.¹⁹² It is a real service of J. Barber to have shown that in the field of modern history Stalin's letter to the Editor of the periodical *Proletarskaya Revolucija* in October 1931 was the critical turning-point.¹⁹³ In Ancient History this turning-point came somewhat later, in 1934.¹⁹⁴ So it is presumably no coincidence that thanks to A. S. Svanidze and A. V. Mišulin *V. D. I.* (which means the *Journal for the Study of Antiquity*) was founded;¹⁹⁵ to this day no comparable periodical exists [in the USSR] for the history of the Middle Ages. Mainly thanks to Mišulin, the usefulness of Ancient History had been demonstrated to Stalin and the Party, and as such was recognized as deserving encouragement. Whether this has enriched research is another question.

The war of 1941-5 reduced Clio to almost complete silence.¹⁹⁶ When at the beginning of 1946 the publication of *V. D. I.* was resumed, it was indicative that an unsigned leading article should have quoted from a speech of Stalin of 9 February 1946, delivered in his constituency in Moscow: "I am sure that if we give our men of science the help they need, we will not only draw level with the achievements of scientists abroad, but will overtake them". The writer of this leader (A. V. Mišulin ?) promised

in the name of 'historians and archaeologists' to "prove themselves worthy of the era of Stalin".¹⁹⁷ This 'era of Stalin' was notable for its Greater Russian chauvinism and the "struggle against kowtowing to the West". After 1948 the "struggle against the 'homeless cosmopolitans'" was added.¹⁹⁸ Just two weeks after Stalin's death on 5 March 1953, the Praesidium of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR prepared a resolution in the spirit of the Era of Stalin in which many books of reputable historians were condemned as 'damaging'. We have seen often enough what such a condemnation can mean for the books and also for their authors. But after the 'thunder and lightning', this time no storm followed, but the 'Thaw' from 1954-6, in which more scholarly opinions began to break through against the stubborn resistance of the Stalinists, particularly against those entrenched in the editorial board of the journal *Voprosy Istorii* ('Problems of History').

After the Twentieth Party Congress a short spring-time of hopes blossomed, with a degree of freedom in academic research, but its limitations became clear after the Hungarian Rising. But it was not 'back to the old order' either. At the start of the 60's some courageous ancient historians fought for their opinions, which were not always those approved in high places, and have even dared to mention the 'tragic fate' of some—though not all—of their colleagues who have 'disappeared'. It was after the invasion of Czechoslovakia in August 1968 and following what was initially a highly selective persecution of 'dissidents' (*e. g.* the historians A. Nekrič and Peter Jakir, as well as the writers A. Sinjavskij and Ju. Daniel),¹⁹⁹ that the regime has noticeably tightened its control over the field of Ancient History too. In spite of this, a relatively free expression of opinion has been allowed in the 70's, thanks to the policy of *détente*, intended in the main for abroad and not for the general public inside the Soviet Union. This is the explanation of the significant differences of content between scholarly publications and the contents of textbooks and works of reference. That new ideas do however occasionally get through to the general public may be illustrated by the following anecdote:— In a long queue outside a bookshop, a Mr. X asked the lady next to him, who did not look in the least like someone who might be interested in Ancient History: "Little mother, what are you waiting for?" The answer came back pat: "They are selling in there some book or other about our past". What she meant was in fact S. L. Utčenko's book on Julius Caesar. We in the West could do with queues like that outside our bookshops.

APPENDIX A

CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE

Period	Years	Characterization of the period
I	a. 1917-1921	Revolution and Civil War: upheavals in teaching and research, inevitable in the circumstances
	b. 1921-1927	Time of the 'Old Specialists': toleration
	c. 1927-1934	Attack by the 'Marxists': decline in co-existence
II	a. 1934-1941	'Marxist' Ancient History—extermination of opponents
	b. 1941-1945	War and its inevitable disturbances; little research, and that with a patriotic tone.
	c. 1945-1948	Ždanovism—anti-western chauvinist distortions
	d. 1948-1953	'Anti-cosmopolitanism'— increasing chauvinist distortions
III	1954-1956	The 'Thaw': struggle between Stalinist and more serious academic research
IV	a. Feb. 1956— March 1957	The 'Spring': time of an attempt at a marxist interpretation of history
	b. 1957-1968	The so-called 'liberal' period: party loyalty in the sense of the XX and XXII Party Congresses
	c. 1968-1986	Period of 'responsible' research: strengthening of control by the Party. Limited renewal of politeness towards Western research

NOTES

1. F. VITTINGHOFF, (1969, pp. 279-86); P. L. PETTIT, (1972, pp. 9-27); M. RASKOLNIKOFF, (1975); H. HEINEN, 1980, pp. 256 ff. and Introd. pp. 1 ff.). For an understandably over-favourable assessment of Raskolnikoff's book see A. J. PAVLOVSKAJA (1979, pp. 23 ff.).
2. S. N. BENKLIEV (1948, p. 176: "Spartacus' uprising is the commonest and favourite theme of external students who are examined in Universities".); K. F. SHTEPPIA (1962, p. 34: "the only hero of antiquity whom schoolchildren [sic. of the 1920's] know at all well was Spartacus").
3. The two outdated monographs in German by E. MÜLLER (Salzburg, 1905) and J. MUSZKAT-MUSZKOWSKI (Leipzig, 1909) are still basic but cf. P. OLIVA and VĚRA OLIVOVÁ, 1960, pp. 117-139 and 1980, pp. 89-99.
4. See e.g. K. LIEBKNECHT in K. ZEISLER (ed.), 1961, p. 21):

*Because Spartacus—
That means fire and spirit,
That means heart and soul
That means will and deed—
Of the revolution of the proletariat.*

Cf. E. MEYER (ed.), 1927, pp. 5; 10-20 (selection of pamphlets of the German Spartacists); see also E. BADIA (1967), and from the Soviet viewpoint, M. I. KRIVOGUZ (1962).

5. V. I. LENIN (1949⁴, vol. 24, pp. 35-68; *ibid.* 1951⁴, vol. 36, p. 306). Cf. E. J. HOBBSAWM (1973, pp. 49-53); G. W. STROBEL (1974).
6. P. S. BOGDANOV and N. N. RJAŠČENCEV (1976³, cols. 846-848).
7. See, from the Soviet viewpoint, M. V. NEČKINA (1960, pp. 71-91, esp. p. 80, n. 19) and her definitive summing-up of the discussion within the Soviet Union in the years 1959-1962); *ibid.* 1962, pp. 57-78, where (p. 57) she admits that one is dealing with 'a young and not as yet fully developed branch of knowledge'. Cf. also G. D. ALEKSEEVA *et al.*, 1974, pp. 82-94; E. N. GORODECKIJ, 1976, pp. 3-39; ANON., (1977/4, pp. 3-16) where, in an unsigned leading article, a time-division for the historiography of ancient history is given as follows: 1917-1929; 1929-1934 or 1929-1941; the 1940's; the first half of the 1950's, 1956 and following years. For Western time-divisions, cf. H. HEINEN (1980, pp. 258 ff.).
8. On the problem of the 'old specialists' see S. A. FEDJUKIN, 1960, pp. 90-111 (esp. pp. 98 ff.); cf. K. F. STEPPA, 1962, pp. 49 ff.; E. K. PUTNYN', 1959, pp. 171-190.
9. S. FITZPATRICK, 1970, pp. 74 ff., 77 ff.; G. M. ENTEEN, 1974, vol. 22, No. 1 pp. 56-67; J. BARBER, 1981, pp. 19 ff.
10. See the obituary notice in ANON, (1932^a), pp. 1-3.
11. J. BARBER, 1981, p. 23; P. H. ARON, *apud* J. S. KEEP, (ed.), 1962, p. 283.
12. ANON., 1949/3, p. 3: "The year 1934 is a decisive turning-point in Soviet historical science. The mask was torn from the face of Pokrovskij's 'school', and its errors undone,...this brought Soviet Historians under the Party's

direction, and thanks to the personal guidance of Comrade Stalin, led to a development of a marxist-leninist science of history". For an example of the attacks on Pokrovskij's pupils, see P. DROZDOV, in *Pravda* for 27 March 1937: "The traitors who support and cover up for each other, are pursuing a mean course of pestilential activity, in which they exploit the blindness, carelessness and idiotically sickly irresponsibility of some Communist historians". "The Central Committee of the Party and Comrade Stalin calls on all intellectuals, including Soviet historians, to bring to an end with all speed and with the utmost energy the unacceptable backwardness of the theoretical Front...Soviet historians will have this important aim put before them, to overcome the damaging views of Pokrovskij and to liquidate the effects of this sabotage on the historical front". (This quotation is taken from a work in two volumes of multiple authorship entitled *Against the Historical Conceptions of M. N. Pokrovskij*, published in 1939-40 (vol. 1, p. 4); on this see EM. JAROSLAVSKIJ, 1939, p. 5; ANON, 1948, p. 3 *et al.*, also the essay issued in Paris by P. MILJUKOV, 1937, pp. 368-387.) On the revised attitude after the XX Party Congress, see S. M. DUBROVSKIJ, 1962, pp. 3-40 (this essay was delivered as a lecture and attracted much attention, yet it needed four years for approval for it to be printed). See too O. D. SOKOLOV, 1970 and the review of this work by A. I. ZEVELEV and A. D. PEDOSOV, 1973, pp. 155-77. For Western literature on the rehabilitation, see P. K. URBAN, (Munich) 1962, pp. 31-42; G. M. ENTEEN, 1969, pp. 306-320; J. BARBER, 1981, pp. 25 ff.

13. C. E. BLACK, (ed.) 1956, p. 27; K. F. SHTEPPIA, 1962, pp. 209-241; S. I. KOVALEV, 1947, p. 115: "It is only in appearance that Ancient History is occupied with abstract problems. In reality it has always been a place of refuge for reactionary, anti-scientific views hostile to marxism". See too ANON, 1947^b p. 10 "The whole extent of the damage done by anti-scientific 'theories' of Ed. Meyer, T. Frank, Rostovcev and Bickermann must be exposed", and ANON, 1949^a p. 10 "In recent years Soviet historians of antiquity have intensified the struggle against bourgeois historiography, which falsifies history in the interests of American and British imperialists".
14. ANON., 1947^b, p. 3; M. A. KOROSTOVCEV, in: G. Ja. Tarle *et al.* (edd.), 1942, pp. 190 f.
15. A. L. SIDOROV, 1955, vol. VI, pp. 392 f. However too much criticism was unwelcome, and the reply came from Nečkina and others in 1961 (issue of *Kommunist* No. 9, p. 58): "Soviet historical writing has come a long way. The time has now come to pass judgement on the results achieved under the leadership of the Communist Party. This will help historians to do better work...and to serve the building of Communism more consciously by their creative activity. There are many to whom the whole length of the road which Soviet historical knowledge has traversed appears to be full of potholes, defects and misconceptions, of tasks unfulfilled and wrong solutions. And abroad our enemies gloat joyfully..." On this new direction, see L. LABEDZ, 1957, pp. 2-13; M. FAINSOD, 1964, pp. 19-33; N. W. HEER, 1971, pp. 61-95; T. McNEILL, 1977, pp. 3-10.
16. ANON, 1956^a, p. 4; G. G. DILIGENSKIJ, 1961, pp. 124-137; Id. 1963, pp. 25 ff. and V. D. I. 1961/4 (78) p. 31. On Diligenskij as an 'editor who toes the Party line', see M. I. FINLEY, 1981, p. 68. But there were other voices at that time in the Soviet Union; see e.g. A. BEREZKIN and K. KUZNECOVA, 1960, pp. 85-96.

17. S. FITZPATRICK, 1970, pp. 68 ff., points out, rightly in my view, that initially the Academy of Sciences showed more readiness for reform and collaboration with the Government than did the Universities. But for the Soviets the Universities were the more important, because they were preoccupied with curtailing the influence of anti-bolshevist or non-marxist Professors on their students as quickly as possible.
18. E. I. BOGOLJUBOV, 1906.
19. K. F. SHTEPPA, 1962, pp. 36 ff.; M. RASKOLNIKOFF, 1975, pp. 32 f.; M. I. FINLEY, 1981, pp. 67 f.
20. E. K. PUTNYN', 1959, p. 173 (esp. n. 2); M. V. NEČKINA, *et al.* 1961, p. 62: 'For writers of history Lenin's insistence on "comparing old knowledge with new" is particularly important. For that reason Lenin felt the comparison of bourgeois and marxist judgments of historical events to be essential'; see too EM. JAROSLAVSKIJ, 1939, p. 4.
21. ANON., 1949^a, p. 6: 'The heritage of Lenin in matters of *Partijnost'* in science is the guiding sign-post for all Soviet historians'; Ibid. 1957^b, pp. 7-9.
22. A. M. PANKRATOVA, 1939, vol. I, pp. 50 ff.; E. M. ŽUKOV, 1980, pp. 40 ff. There was a form of *Partijnost'* also in the West; on this see J. G. DROYSEN, 1937⁵ (repr. 1967) p. 287 (against Wachsmuth): "I reject out of hand this kind of eunuchoid objectivity. I wish to have shown nothing more and nothing less than the relative truth of my position, in so far as my country, my political and my religious conviction and my dedicated study has assured my attaining it." B. G. MOGIL'NICKIJ, 1967, (pp.32 ff., 39 ff., 43 ff., 49-51) tries to show that *Partijnost* and objectivity are not mutually exclusive; but cf. the critical remarks of J. ENGEL, 1959, p. 327, n. 1. N. A. BURMISTROV, 1968, p. 18, went a step further by asserting that *partijnost'* is independent of the historian's wishes, being an objective attribute of historical perception, and is part of all the main components of the science of history. It [*sc. partijnost'*] appears in the sources, in the point of view of the historian and in the methods of research. Above all, the basic principles that guide a historian are established by *partijnost'*." *Partijnost* was again defended as a positive element by V. T. PASUTO *et al.*, 1970, p. 70.
23. J. BARBER, 1981, pp. 1 f.; A. M. PANKRATOVA, 1939, vol. I, pp. 50 f.
24. ANON, 1930, p. 5.
25. G. ZAIDEL, (ed.), 1931, p. 105.
26. ANON., 1949^a, p. 6; E. K. PUTNYN', 1959, p. 175; A. S. ŠOFMAN, 1971, pp. 18-23, 28; R. M. RACHMANOVA, 1972, p. 11, who asserts that Vladimir Ul'janov (Lenin) "had already at the time of his *Abitur* acquired a particularly deep-felt idea of the class-struggle. With the example of his own family before him (i. e., the execution of his brother Alexander—author's note) he had sensed the gruesome realities of Czarist justice, and thus the plebeians and their ideals of freedom and equality did not seem out-dated. For this reason it is not mere chance that the fiery Spartacus, the champion of the freedom of thousands of enslaved persons in ancient Rome, was one of the favourite heroes of V. I. Lenin and also of Karl Marx".
27. V. I. KUZISČIN, (ed.) 1980, p. 326; cf. R. M. RACHMANOVA, 1972, pp. 18 f. 'V. I. Lenin stresses in particular that this uprising [of Spartacus] can be characterized as "the greatest of the Civil War [!] of the time of slave-ownership"...In a speech delivered at a meeting at the Polytechnic Museum in 1918 he again stressed that "...Spartacus began a war for the protection of the suppressed classes...This was a just war, this war cannot be criticized."

28. The expression 'Vulgar Marxism' was coined in the Soviet Union; see the Resolution of the Central Committee of the CPSU on 14 November 1938, in: A. M. PANKRATOVA, 1939, vol. I, p. 3; EM. JAROSLAVSKIJ, *ibid.*, vol. II, p. 5 f.
29. M. RASKOLNIKOFF, 1975, p. 67.
30. The language and terminology of the Civil War is forcefully expressed, as *e. g.* in S. LOZINSKIJ, 1924, p. 54, who writes: "the consequence of Rome's victory was that Rome became domestically a capitalist state but in its foreign policy boldly trod the path of imperialism, that is the path leading to the conquest of all markets..."; cf. V. I. NEDELSKIJ, 1931, p. 166 (with a wrong date): "this transformation of the *latifundium* into a market-orientated economy finds expression as early as the second half of the 1st century BC [*sic!*] in the wars against Greece and Mithridates, which could only be explained as the effect of mercantile competition."
31. E. K. PUTNYN', 1959, pp. 175-8; M. RASKOLNIKOFF, 1975, pp. 46-52.
32. ANON., 1947^a, p. 7; *Ibid.* 1949^b, p. 4. For Kovalev's recognition of his own mistakes, see KOVALEV, 1957, p. 42; he was imprisoned from 1939 till 1940, and his colleague N. A. MAŠKIN, 1939, p. 79 promptly dubbed him the 'pseudo-historian'.
33. M. A. KOROSTOVCEV, *apud* G. JA. TARLE, 1942, p. 207; A. L. SIDOROV, 1955, pp. 404 ff.; S. FITZPATRICK, 1979, pp. 233; 323 n. 128. For the direct intervention of the 'Dictator of Culture', A. A. ŽDANOV, in the content of text-books cf. ANON., 1949^b, pp. 6-9, as *e.g.* p. 7: 'A. A. ŽDANOV's requirement from ancient historians represents the most weighty encouragement to them to ensure that the demonstration should be creatively effective and be linked directly to the tasks of the present day. Ancient History is an important and entirely relevant sector of the ideological-political struggle of the whole Soviet people for the building of communism. Soviet Ancient historians in their own sector develop Soviet science, give education in Soviet patriotism and struggle against the corrupting influence of bourgeois historical writing, for the honour and esteem of Russian, Soviet science'. The military language and the frequency of the word 'Soviet' in this quotation is worth noting.
34. S. I. KOVALEV, 1936, pp. 164 f., 204 f.; V. S. SERGEEV 1935, p. 86; p. 95.
35. P. F. PREOBRAŽENSKIJ, 1965, p. 65. (I have not been able to establish the date of this contribution; it seems that one is dealing with a MS which remained unpublished for a long time, and was first printed in 1965). The official date of Preobraženskij's death may be arbitrary, according to F. Svetov, 1985, p. 22, arguing from analogy with the official date of the death of his own father, who was arrested on 31 May 1936 and subsequently shot.
36. See on this L. ČUKOVSKAJA, 1979, pp. 21 f. "Intentional passing over in silence reduces the past to a state of non-existence. Even if it did once exist, it is just as if it had never been...The calculation is absolutely right. The process of erasing memory has gone on and goes forward incessantly..."
37. L. V. BAŽENOV, 1931, pp. 29 f., cf. V. I. NEDEL'SKIJ, 1931, p. 165.
38. For the arrest and execution of S. G. Fridlyand, the Dean of Moscow University and of many of his colleagues in 1936-7, see now the personal reminiscences of his son, F. SVETOV, 1985, pp. 22-32; 36-9; 42-51; 268-279 *et passim*. At present both the author and his wife, the Russian-Orthodox writer and activist Zoga Krachmalnikova, are in prison for their beliefs.

39. Cited from V.A. DOROŠENKO, 1966, p. 15, n. 24; cf. G. D. ALEKSEEVA, 1968, pp. 202 ff., esp. p. 272.
40. L. V. IVANOVA, 1980, p.255 (*et passim*); cf. J. BARBER, 1981, p. 140 (for victims of the struggle) and pp. 17-9 for another estimate of Pokrovskij's activities in these years. See however ANON., 1932^a, p. 3: "in these works, directed against the old bourgeois concepts as also against artificial new patterns which falsify historical events, M. N. P(okrovskij) showed himself to be an uncompromising, utterly steadfast Bolshevik-Leninist. In a whole series of cases he helped the Party with such revelations about bourgeois historiography to strip bare the counter-revolutionary essence and the anti-intellectual character of Trotskyism." For the meaning of the accusation of 'Trotskyism', see B. E. GINZBURG, 1979, vol. 2, p. 162: "Until doomsday (*i. e.* for ever) one left behind [*sc.* in the prison-camps in 1947] all those against whose names the letter 'T' (the stigma of the devil of Trotskyism) stood in the files." For proof that the repression of ideological opponents was Prokovskij's intention, see A. M. PANKRATOVA, 1939, p. 39: "In his 'theses' (so Pokrovskij wrote) 'the situation of the passing moment requires the participation of the Universities in the laying of the foundations of the socialist economy. A precondition for the solution of this problem is the *militarization* [italics in original] of the University...' In effect this meant that, according to Pokrovskij's plan, a military type of control should be suspended over Universities and the collegiate administration be replaced by political Commissars, who should consist of military-communist front-line soldiers,...".
41. G. K. VON RAUCH, 1962, pp. 217-144 (cited from the Russian edn.); see too M. V. NEČKINA, 1962, p. 62; S. FITZPATRICK, 1979, p. 211.
42. P. H. ARON, *apud* J. S. KEEP, 1962, pp. 286f., 293; M. N. POKROVSKIJ, 1927², p. 10: "Every historical work is above all else an example of an ideology in miniature...What is 'ideology'? It is a mirror-image of actuality in the understanding of men by means of prismatic refraction of their interests, mainly class-interests." For a Soviet criticism of this view, see *e. g.* A. M. PANKRATOVA, 1939, pp. 43 f.
43. P. H. ARON, 1962, p. 296.
44. Cited in ANON., 1932, p. 3; see A. M. PANKRATOVA, 1939, p. 49, who not unexpectedly criticizes this view; EM. JAROSLAVSKIJ, 1940, vol. II, p. 9; A. L. SIDOROV, 1955, p. 393 *et alib.*
45. M. P. PUTILOVSKIJ, 1929 (for peasants; full of unintended humour. The breakdown of discipline and the final defeat of Spartacus are ascribed to the introduction of vodka into their camp [p. 26]); A. MICHAILOV, 1927 (for children and childish).
46. J. BURIAN, 1960, pp. 3-25.
47. K. P. KORŽEVA, 1914, p. 118 (German version in *Klio* 61, 1979, pp. 477-96).
48. A. GUARINO, 1980, pp. 9 f.
49. The book is based on a lecture of 1919 and had been, in the opinion of some Soviet historians, already published in 1926: see *e. g.* E. K. PUTNYN', 1959, p. 174. However the *communis opinio* gives 1929, see *e. g.* A. V. MIŠULIN, 1938^a, p. 7: "Lenin's work published for the first time in 1929"; S. L. UTČENKO, 1966, vol. iv, p. 584: "The publication of Lenin's essay *On the State* in 1929 meant the beginning of a new stage in the development of Soviet historiography of antiquity". See now H. HEINEN, 1980, p. 270, wrongly cited by R. BICHLER,

- 1983, p. 190, n. 518; R. A. PADGUG, 1976, p. 7, and many others. Why the date of publication is to this day a matter of controversy in the Soviet Union must be investigated separately. Cf. H. HEINEN (ed.), 1980, p. 270 (misquoted by R. BICHLER, 1983, p. 190, n. 518; R. A. PADGUG, 1976, p. 7).
50. M. KUBLANOV, 1964, p. 11: "Lenin's essay 'On the State' was first published in 1929. In the text human history was seen as a unified, progressive and regular process, and the doctrine of the social-economic structure (*formation*) as an expression of those general and uniformly applicable laws of nature and history which show themselves in the multiplicity of actual historical events. This work had far-reaching echoes. In research into antiquity it provoked many academic discussions, in the course of which the views of the Soviet school of historical studies took shape". Cf. ANON., 1957^a, pp. 10-13; S. L. UTČENKO, 1966, p. 587; ANON., *V. D. I.* 1970 (112), pp. 5-9 (especially the summing up of the views of A. S. Šofman, (1971) on pp. 16-8); K. P. KORŽEVA, 1971, p. 148; E. M. ŠTAERMAN, 1971, pp. 5-47; R. M. RACHMANOVA, 1972, pp. 17-9; E. M. ŽUKOV, 1975, pp. 5-17; A. EFIMOV, 1975, pp. 18-44.
 51. M. A. KOROSTOVCEV, 1942, p. 191; A. V. MIŠULIN, 1939, pp. 17, 25ff. In 1939 L. P. BERIA, better known for his work-a-day activities [*i.e.* as Chief of the State Secret Police from 1939 to 1953] than for his contribution to Party doctrine, asserted (1939⁵, p. 122) that already in 1906 Comrade Stalin had set out the mechanism of the change in the forms of society: thus Stalin perhaps preceeded Lenin; cf. JU. KROTKOV, 1978, p. 233; G. F. ALEKSANDROV, 1952, pp. 3-21 (esp. pp. 9 ff.); M. P. BASKIN, *ibid.* pp. 187-192.
 52. See V. I. KUZIŠČIN's lecture quoted in *V. D. I.* 1970/2 (112) pp. 13-6; T. V. BLAVATSKAJA, *ibid.*, pp. 20-1; E. M. ŠTAERMAN, 1968, p. 647, also diverges from Lenin when she writes: "A number of suppositions makes it possible for us to assume that ancient society was an exception and not the rule...for the main course of human development".
 53. J. V. STALIN, vol. 13, 1951, p. 239 (speech to the first All-Soviet Congress of Kolchoz-peasants); cf. p. 296 (Report to the 17th Party Congress of 26 January 1934). This remark (which bears the stamp of genius) is found repeated *ad nauseam* in Soviet historiography up till 1953. On Stalin as a historian, cf. ANON., in *V. D. I.* 1939/4 (9), pp. 3-15; P. VYŠINSKIJ, *s. v.* Revolucija, in: *B. S. E.* xlviii, cols. 402 ff., Moscow, 1941. CH. PARAIN, 19 pp. 106-7, may have come to regret his enthusiasm for Stalin as a historian.
 54. W. Z. RUBINSOHN, 1980, p. 56. In this respect the following anecdote is revealing. It concerns a brochure written by L. L. RAKOV, a pupil of S. I. KOVALEV, entitled *On the Problem of the Disintegration of Slave-owning Society in IGAIMK* 66 (1933), pp. 3-50. The writer concluded that slave-revolts could not develop into fully-fledged revolutions. (p. 50) The censor signed the permit to publish on 10 January 1933, and it went to press. Stalin's speech was made on 19 February. Shortly after midnight Rakov's telephone rang. He was ordered to present himself that same morning (20 February) at his Institute. The offending page was torn out, and he was instructed to rewrite it in accordance with Stalin's rather unexpected 'historical insight'. Later on Rakov himself termed these days as 'the ten days that shook the slave-owning world' [cited from B. YA. KOPRŽIVA LURIA, 1987, p. 143.]
 55. ANON., (? S. I. KOVALEV) 1949^b, p. 3; E. N. GORODECKIJ, 1960, p. 98; *contra* M. V. NEČKINA, 1962, p. 64.

56. A. V. FOCHT, (1940, vol. II, pp. 485 ff.) rightly accuses Pokrovskij for "having no firm view in regard to the teaching of history in Soviet schools...and for this reason going over in 1922-3 to a position of abandoning history as a subject of instruction and to its replacement by instruction in social science". See too G. D. ALEKSEEVA, 1966, p. 240; the allocation of History to the Social Sciences, rather than to the Humanities, apparently remains a problem for Soviet historians; cf. e. g. A. S. ŠOFMAN *et al.*, 1968, pp. 3-13; S. FITZPATRICK, 1939, pp. 231 f.
57. E. V. GUTNOVA, 1967, pp. 370 ff.: "The history of the Middle Ages was inserted as a historical discipline in its own right, as a necessary and useful branch of historical knowledge".
58. K. F. ŠTEPPA, 1962, pp. 123 ff., 146 ff.; S. I. KOVALEV, 1957, p. 43; M. V. NEČKINA, 1962, p. 73; N. A. BURMISTROV, 1971, pp. 101-111.
59. A. V. MIŠULIN, 1934^b, p. 13 (esp. n. 1).
60. V. V. ALTMAN, (ed.) 1964, p. 15.
61. We manage to trace something of this apprehensiveness in, e. g. S. A. ŽEBELEV *et al.*, 1934, p. 152 "Whatever formulation we give of the actual statement of this contradiction (within the slave-owner society), it is certain..."
62. F. L. GANSHOF, 1960, pp. 15 f.; N. I. KONRAD, 1966, pp. 43 f.; S. E. KRAPIVENSKIJ, 1967, pp. 52-75; L. V. DANILOVA, 1968, vol. I, pp. 37 f.; S. D. SKAZKINA *et al.*, 1977, pp. 78 f., 84 f. Cf. however M. A. BARG, 1980, pp. 68 f., 76 ff., and the summary in A. S. KOCEVALOV, 1956, pp. 38 ff.; A. R. KORSUNSKIJ, 1964, pp. 95-111; A. L. KAC, 1967, pp. 212-229.
63. For a critical summing-up of the problems raised by the multi-stage revolution, see S. L. UTČENKO, 1969, pp. 60 ff. For representations of it in the historical literature of the time, see L. L. RAKOV, 1933, pp. 22-4; O. O. KRUGER, 1934, pp. 129-131; S. I. KOVALEV, 1934, pp. 314 ff., Id., 1936, pp. 164 ff.; K. F. ŠTEPPA, 1934, p. 116.
64. O. O. KRUGER, 1934, p. 125.
65. ANON., 1958/4, p. 171.
66. R. CONQUEST, 1968, p. 79; p. 143. Even after the Twentieth Party Congress A. I. TJUMENEV, (1957, p. 34) and K. P. KORŽEVA, (1964, p. 225, n. 24) did not tell the truth, in that in the usual fashion they passed over Svanidze and made A.V. Mišulin the first editor. In this case too M. RASKOLNIKOFF, (1975, p. 113) accepts the official Soviet version, in spite of M. A. KOROSTOVCEV, (1962, p. 121) who should have succeeded in convincing them, because N. S. Chruščev had made known 'the tragic circumstances of his death' at the 22nd Party Congress. So too ANON., 1967, p. 5: "The first editor of *V. D. I.*, A. S. Svanidze, was unable to display any activity in this appointment, since in the year 1937 he was imprisoned on a false charge and met his death. All who have the interests of our subject at heart honour his memory as one of the initiators of this periodical".
67. A. V. MIŠULIN defended his Doctoral dissertation on 2 March 1943; it was entitled *Antičnaja Ispanija do Ustanovlinija Rimskoj Provincial'noj Sistemy v 197 g. do n. e.* One of his official opponents was N. A. Maškin; Mišulin had been his opponent on 2 May 1942. See T. ŠEPUNOVA, 1946, p. 207; ANON., 1948^b, p. 133 (No.4). Mišulin's doctoral thesis was published posthumously in 1952, with the same title as his dissertation.

68. A. V. MIŠULIN, 1938^b, pp. 17-24, on the publication of the 'short teaching course' of the history of the CP of the USSR: "a work of the highest academic importance, in the creation of which Comrade Stalin, the teacher of the Party, took an active part", (p. 17); Id., 1938^c, p. 35; ANON., 1939, pp. 3-15: in this anonymous editorial contribution (written by Mišulin) we find: "Stalin—this name is a symbol and a rallying standard of the struggle on behalf of the workers of the world..." (p. 3) or "the inspired acuteness of Comrade Stalin..." (p. 4), or "the theory formulated by Comrade Stalin, and its sensitive and clear analysis...Some decrees of the Party and the government and the personal speeches of Comrade Stalin give historians not only important directions, but also solve concrete historical problems..." (p. 9): "the Central Committee of the CP of the USSR and Comrade Stalin have achieved a gigantic task in putting the science of history on its proper course..." (p. 10): "Comrade Stalin's writings have given an exhaustive formulation of the laws of social development in an inspired and simple terminology..." (p. 13), and—the prize specimen—"Comrade Stalin's style as a theoretician is wonderful. His profound thinking is linked to an unusual simplicity and clarity of expression...this suits not only the clarity of his thought but also his exceptional love for the workers and his character as a genuine leader". (*Vožd'*), (p. 15). See too Mišulin, 1939, pp. 28 f., *et al.*
69. A. V. MIŠULIN, 1934^a, pp. 132-162; Id., 1935, pp. 116-133; Id., 1937, pp. 133-142.
70. A. V. MIŠULIN, 1936^a and 1936^b.
71. For the control of publications by the Party, see N. W. HEER, 1971, pp. 34 ff. (with bibliography); for a description based on personal experience, see A. NEKRIČ, 1979, or the epic saga of a Professor of Literature in the Soviet Union and the publication of an anthology in E. ETKIND, 1981.
72. A. V. MIŠULIN, 1936^b, p. 53
73. A. V. MIŠULIN, 1936^a, p. 98
74. A. V. MIŠULIN, *s. v.* Spartak, in: *B. S. E.* lii, col. 370.
75. A. V. MIŠULIN, 1936^a, pp. 91 f., pp. 96 f.
76. J. RÜHLE, 1963, pp. 98 f.
77. S. B. VESELOVSKIJ, 1945, pp. 57-69.
78. S. V. BACHRUŠIN, 1942 (1945²),
79. For criticism of the 'wrong' interpretation of Ivan the Terrible in Eisenstein's film *Bol'saja Žizn*, see the Decree of the Central Committee of the CP of the USSR of 4 September 1946, in: *Bol'shevik* 1946, xxiii no. 16, p. 52, and the memoirs of the actor N. K. ČERKASOV, 1953, pp. 380-2. See too M. SLONIM, 1977², p. 305. For a summary of the academic discussion see: A. A. ZIMIN, 1960, pp. 30-52; R. O. CRUMMEY, 1977, pp. 57-74.
80. A. L. SIDOROV, 1955, p. 393; cf. Z. M. ČERNILOVSKIJ, 1960², p. 77 f.
81. A. V. MIŠULIN, 1936^b, has an 88-page Appendix giving the texts which he had used. Is it merely coincidence that it was S. P. Kondrat'ev and not Mišulin himself who undertook the preparation of the texts? (p. 197, n. 1).
82. G. SERGIEVSKIJ, 1936, pp. 63-71.
83. P. F. PREOBRAŽENSKIJ, 1936, pp. 207-8.

84. On Preobraženskij's fate, see n. 35 above. See too A. AUTORCHANOV, 1959, pp. 182 f. It is not clear to me whether he put in an appearance at the Congress of Historians in Oslo in 1928 (as M. RASKOLNIKOFF, 1975, p. 76 says) or whether he had been included in the list of Soviet representatives, but was forbidden to travel (as K. F. SHTEPPIA, 1962, p. 43 asserts). I would be much indebted to any reader for information on this point, and also on Sergievskij's biography in general.
85. G. SERGIEVSKIJ, 1936, p. 63.
86. G. SERGIEVSKIJ, *ibid.* p. 64.
87. K. M. KOLOBOVA, 1967, p. 26; E. M. ŠTAERMAN, 1978, pp. 77 f.; 128 f.; 194 ff; V. I. KUZISČIN, 1983, pp. 366-8.
88. A. BURFORD, 1972, p. 60; G. ALFÖLDY, 1975, pp. 45 ff. M. I. FINLEY, 1973 (German translation, 1981) p. 92; P. GARNSEY, 1980, pp. 34-72; J. M. FRAYN, 1979, p. 29: "although the number of small-holders in the course of time underwent significant variation, in the whole period from 500 BC down to the end of the second century AD, the small-holding economy must be seen as one of the principal occupations in Italy".
89. G. SERGIEVSKIJ, 1936, pp. 64 f.
90. G. SERGIEVSKIJ, *ibid.* pp. 68 f.
91. D. MITRANY, 1951; T. K. ČUGUNOV, 1968; cf. N. E. ROSENFELDT, 1980, p. 11. f.
92. Istorija VKP (B), Moscow, 1945 (ed. 1937), pp. 65 ff., 278 ff. On this cf. G. K. VON RAUCH, 1962 (German version, 1977), pp. 221 f., 229 ff.; N. RUTYČ, 1960, pp. 329-333; L. VLADIMIROV, 1969, pp. 111-119; A. AUTORCHANOV, 1983, pp. 199-212; cf. CHR. SCHMIDT-HÄUER, *Die Zeit* No. 10, 28.2, 1986 (Politik) p. 3.
93. K. P. KORŽEVA, 1974, p. 122 (German version in *Klio* 61 (1979), pp. 477 ff.). The justification for so positive an estimate of Mišulin, in spite of the technical defects of his work, is found in KORŽEVA, *ibid.* p. 120: "The fundamental methodological basis of Mišulin's work was the marxist-leninist thesis [Stalin has dropped out, although Mišulin indirectly owed to him the idea of the three-stage revolution—author's note] that the struggle of the slaves in antiquity was a logically inevitable result of the slave-owner system, and that the impetus which set in motion all uprisings was rooted in the material background of slave-ownership"; this means that Mišulin's ideological purity is unassailable. Cf. J. BURIAN, 1960, p. 25 who admits in 1960 that Mišulin's mistake is the outcome of "a too mechanical application of Stalin's thesis of a 'slave-revolution'", but this thesis had as its positive effect a general pre-occupation with slavery as a whole. See V. I. KUZISČIN, 1983, p. 367 f.: "This view [of a combined revolutionary effort by slaves and poor free men] was advanced in the 1930's by Soviet historians, particularly by that great Soviet man of learning A. V. Mišulin,... But current Soviet studies tend to show... [that he was wrong]." Similarly ANON., 1977, p. 7: "A. V. Mišulin's monograph *Spartacus' Uprising* (1936) had a tremendous significance, being at that time the only treatment in monograph form of the history of the class-struggle in world-literature..." As a matter of fact the assertion is untrue, for even in the Soviet Union there had been earlier works on this topic, such as Bogoljubov's work of 1906, (see, e. g. K. M. KOLOBOVA, 1967, p. 15; p. 17, nn. 37-8) and the recurrent theme of world-primacy has an objectionable ring to Western readers.

94. D. D. PETERS, 1940, pp. 57-69. The author is missing from O. I. ŠVEDOVA, 1941, who has an index of Soviet historians who were accepted at that time, but is found in A. A. VORONKOV, 1961; this means that Peters must have been repressed and rehabilitated. [I should be grateful for further information: W. Z. R.]. After the mid-60's formulaic phrases such as 'victim of violation of revolutionary justice' are generally avoided; see E. GINZBURG, pp. 348 f. For the 'Vožd'-cult, see K. MEHNERT, 1953², p. 46; L. YARESH, *apud* C. E. BLACK, 1956, pp. 95-101.
95. D. D. PETERS, *ibid.* p. 57.
96. D. D. PETERS, *ibid.* p. 60.
97. D. D. PETERS, *ibid.* p. 63.
98. D. D. PETERS, *ibid.* p. 67; cf. V. I. NEDEL'SKIJ, 1931, p. 165, who restricts the supporters of Spartacus to 'slaves from the villas and the *latifundia*.'
99. ANON., 1960, p. 249 (an official obituary, which passes over his repression in silence). See however M. KUBLANOV, 1964, p. 13, where this is expressed in an elegant periphrasis: "The violations of Soviet justice, which could occur in the time of the personality-cult of Stalin, had their effects on S. I. Kovalev's life-story. For some time he was forcibly separated from his work. He returned to Leningrad before the war..." (No mention of the person by whom he was 'forcibly separated from his work' or of the place from which he 'returned').
100. S. I. KOVALEV, 1947^a, pp. 91-99, in an essay entitled "Two Problems in Roman History", (pp. 86-99). He gave as the basis for his choice of subject: "the methodological significance which extends beyond the limitations of Ancient History", (p. 86). For a summary in German of Kovalev's views, see *Bibl. Class. Orient.* vol. IV, 1959, pp. 146-148.
101. K. F. ŠHTEPPA, 1962, pp. 209-241; N. RUTYČ, 1960, pp. 403-6; M. SLONIM, 1977², p. 307. H. SWAYZE, 1962, pp. 60-4, interprets the 'struggle against the homeless cosmopolitans' somewhat differently.
102. See above, n. 33; cf. A. V. MIŠULIN, 1938^c, pp. 25-35; ANON., 1947^a, p. 3; ANON., 1948^a, pp. 3 ff.
103. S. I. KOVALEV, 1947^a, p. 92.
104. S. I. KOVALEV, *ibid.*, p. 97; quite astonishingly this dictum of Stalin is still accepted as a guideline by M. DOI, 1985, p. 11f.
105. S. I. KOVALEV, *ibid.*, p. 95.
106. S. I. KOVALEV, *ibid.*, p. 93.
107. S. I. KOVALEV, *ibid.*, pp. 94 f.
108. S. I. KOVALEV, *ibid.*, p. 96.
109. H. JÜNGER, 1966, p. 181 (cited from the English edition, 1970); cf. A. AUTORCHANOV, 1959, p. 263; H. SWAYZE, pp. 33 ff., 42-7, 148 ff.; M. SLONIM, 1977, pp. 180 ff. For the treatment of the subject of partizan warfare during the Second World War in Soviet historiography, cf. A. A. KURNOSOV, 1965, pp. 169-193. M. I. Kalinin, once the President of the USSR, gave an official formulation: "Partizans are the representatives of the Soviet State in the rear of the enemy" (quotation from KURNOSOV, p. 171 n. 5).
110. See W. G. HAHN, 1982, pp. 70-78; 111, for the consequences of Stalin's growing suspiciousness and of Ždanov's fall from power and its fatal effects on some of the Humanities.

111. N. A. MAŠKIN, 1949, pp. 294-6; A. A. MOTUS-BEKKER, 1948, pp. 64-78; O. V. KUDRJAVCEV, 1954, pp. 11-15; Id., 1957, pp. 268-288: "the course of the externally activated struggle of the free elements against each other led to a fresh outbreak of slave-unrest, and in Italy the great uprising of Spartacus ran its course,—it was the most colossal slave-uprising of the Mediterranean world. The Spartacus-uprising forced different groups of free men to move nearer to each other; its outcome was the overthrow of the Sullan settlement". This is to say that Spartacus' uprising is for Kudrjavcev a purely Mediterranean slave-uprising; its instigators came from the East (p. 287), the free men closed their ranks against him, and the flowering time of the slave-owner system only came in the first century AD. Kudrjavcev was a very talented and original historian, who unfortunately died at the age of 34 of a heart condition on 24 August 1955.
112. S. L. UTČENKO, 1951, pp. 20 ff.; Id., 1952^a, p. 19, p. 28; Id. 1953, pp. 157-165.
113. A. NEKRIČ, 1979, pp. 49 ff.
114. S. L. UTČENKO, 1952^a, p. 7.
115. S. L. UTČENKO, 1951, p. 21, distinguishes between the various social levels of free men who fought amongst each other, but made common cause against the slaves.
116. S. L. UTČENKO, E. M. ŠTAERMAN, 1960, p. 19: "It has already been pointed out that initially class and order of slaves meant the same thing...Gradually however at the end of the Republic and especially during the Principate, the situation changed. Groups emerged from the ranks of the slaves, who could now no longer be reckoned without contradiction as belonging to the unified class of slaves." This is particularly clear in S. L. UTČENKO, I. M. D'JAKONOV, 1971, pp. 129-149 (esp. pp. 138 f.); on this cf. M. I. FINLEY, 1973, p. 77.
117. S. L. UTČENKO, 1965, p. 30, p. 142, p. 146.
118. S. L. UTČENKO, 1969, p. 60; Id., 1972, p. 104; this observation is not intended as a piece of trivial grumbling, but is on the contrary an indicator of the 'silent rehabilitation' of Stalin after 1968. Not in vain did E. EVTUŠENKO as early as 1959 warn us in his poem *To Stalin's Heirs* "The Party has instructed me not to calm down. So even if everybody should quietly repeat to me: 'Calm down', so long as Stalin's heirs exist on earth, it will seem to me that Stalin is still in the Mausoleum".
119. S. L. UTČENKO, 1951, p. 21.
120. S. L. UTČENKO, 1965, p. 148.
121. S. L. UTČENKO, *ibid.* p. 155.
122. S. L. UTČENKO, 1972, p. 102.
123. S. L. UTČENKO, 1976, p. 342; B. ZUCHOLD, 1979, pp. 595 f.
124. See, e. g. the criticism of E. M. ŽUKOV, 1980, pp. 123 f.
125. G. K. VON RAUCH, 1962, p. 553; M. FAINSOD, 1964, pp. 21 f.
126. E. M. ŠTAERMAN, 1956^a (sent to the printer on 6 January of that year), pp. 165 f.
127. E. M. ŠTAERMAN, 1956^b, p. 371; cf. G. G. DILIGENSKIJ, 1963, p. 18: "The creative atmosphere which CP of the USSR generated with its Twentieth Congress, brought with it a deeper and fresher attitude in researchers towards the solution of the most important problems in Ancient History".

128. N. A. MAŠKIN, 1947, p. 266; V. N. D'JAKOV, N. M. NIKOL'SKIJ, 1952, p. 623; the summary of A. A. MOTUS-BEKKER, 1948, p. 78, is well worth attention. She attempted to link Stalinist doctrine with scientific inference in a gloriously grotesque fashion: "The uprising of Spartacus was doomed to failure, but it played a colossal role in the course of progressive history. It taught the dominant class of slave-owners a historic lesson, and also the united barbarians in their continued revolutionary struggle, when they 'overthrew Rome with an almighty bang'."
129. A. A. KURNOSOV, 1965, p. 178; N. W. HEER, 1973, pp. 76 ff.
130. A. NEKRIČ, 1979, pp. 140-152.
131. ANON., 1956^a, p. 3.
132. ANON., 1956^b, pp. 3-6.
133. ANON., 1956^a, p. 6; Id. 1963, pp. 9-10; Id. 1967, pp. 11 f.
134. ANON., 1956^a, pp. 7 f.; J. RÜHLE, 1983, pp. 108-117.
135. Istorija KPSS, Moscow, 1959, p. 649; N. RUTYČ, 1960, pp. 443-450; M. FAINSD, 1964, pp. 25-9; N. W. HEER, 1971, pp. 76-104.
136. ANON., 1960^b, pp. 3-18 (Engl. translation *apud* K. F. SHTEPPIA, 1962, pp. 390-410; see too M. V. NEČKINA *et al.*, 1961, pp. 67 f.; S. O. ŠMIDT, 1962, p. 94.
137. M. I. SERGEENKO, 1958.
138. V. I. KUZISČIN, 1966; Id., 1970^b; Id., 1973; Id. 1976.
139. M. I. SERGEENKO, 1958, pp. 5 f., 10 ff.
140. M. I. SERGEENKO, *ibid.*, pp. 10, 15, 179 ff.
141. V. I. KUZISČIN, 1976, p. 245.
142. V. I. KUZISČIN, 1976, pp. 270 f.
143. On this, cf. P. GARNSEY, 1980, pp. 3-25; J. M. FRAYN, 1979, pp. 84 ff., M. I. FINLEY, 1973, pp. 92 f., 175 f.
144. ANON., 1960^a, p. 7.
145. E. M. ŠTAERMAN, 1957, pp. 52 f.
146. E. M. ŠTAERMAN, 1964, p. 243; Id., 1978, p. 183.
147. E. M. ŠTAERMAN, 1964, p. 245; Id., 1978, p. 113.
148. E. M. ŠTAERMAN, 1978, pp. 179 ff.; Id., 1968, p. 645, pp. 661 f.; cf. 1966, p. 92; 1968, p. 645, pp. 661 f.
149. S. R. KIM, 1979, vol. I, pp. 366-71. (This is a volume of the collected papers delivered at the XIV 'Eirene' Conference of Ancient Historians of Socialist Countries. The contributions of I. Biežuńska-Malowist and R. Lyast (who is now in Israel) were given in précis-form by E. S. GOLUBCOVA, 1979^a, but were not included in the collected volume of papers).
150. S. R. KIM, *ibid.*, p. 366.
151. S. R. KIM, *ibid.*, p. 369.
152. B. F. PORŠNEV's book of 1966 (1979²) and his subsequent (and relevant) article of 1975 were not mentioned. On Poršnev's activities at the end of the 40's see A. NEKRIČ, 1979, p. 57. Poršnev's unusual approach was given a rather tepid review by A. I. GORJAČEVA *et al.*, 1967, pp. 156-9; cf. E. M.

- ŽUKOV, 1980, pp. 198 ff.; M. L. GAVLIN and L. A. KAKAZOVA, 1980, p. 34: "The criticism of the political-juristic theory of revolution is from the side of the psychological direction correct in many respects, but the concepts with which it is contrasted rest on false premisses".
153. ANON., 1960^a, pp. 3-8. The plan for the Historical Institute included ten topics on the theme of 'slavery in antiquity', but nothing on 'slave wars' (which had not been tackled up till then). On the completion of work on these topics, see E. S. GOLUBCOVA, 1977^b, pp. 57-59; cf. N. BROCKMEYER, 1979, pp. 57-62 *et passim*.
 154. Istorija KPSS, 1972⁴, p. 635; M. V. NEČKINA *et al.* 1961, p. 70; ANON., 1970, p. 9; ANON., 1971, p. 5: "The decisions [of the XXIV Party-]Congress envisage the profitable unfolding of the whole front...of science", i. e. even in the area of terminology science has once more become a 'front'.
 155. I. I. VEICKIVSKIJ, 1969, pp. 89-99; 1971, pp. 99-112; 1973, pp. 132-143; P. KARYŠKOVSKIJ, 1958; M. M. SLONIMSKIJ, 1971, pp. 176-177; V. GORSKOV, 1972, pp. 82-87. K. A. REVJAKO, 1981, pp. 107-113. In 1963 V. V. Vinogradov issued a text-book for secondary school teachers on how to teach 'the Role of the Masses in Ancient History'. Instruction on Spartacus should be based on two pictures by contemporary Soviet artists, on the novels of R. Giovagnoli (1874) and V. Jan (1952). According to the latter (p. 59), the aim of Spartacus was the establishment of "an unprecedented state of free, equal and happy people", a clear allusion to Soviet wish-reality. Spartacus failed to achieve this by "liquidating the slave-owning formation", but his uprising did "hasten the fall of the aristocratic republic and the transition to the colonate." Yet Vinogradov rightly emphasizes (p. 117) that teachers should point out that only in the first two centuries AD did the slave-owning system reach its full development, i. e. Spartacus' uprising did not impede its growth.
 156. L. G. TURKINA, 1969, pp. 8-15; K. P. KORŽEVA, pp. 118-134; cf. K. M. KOLOBOVA, 1967, pp. 15-28.
 157. S. L. UTČENKO, 1969, p. 65.
 158. S. L. UTČENKO, *ibid.* pp. 66 f.
 159. P. KARYŠKOVSKIJ, 1958, p. 40
 160. S. N. BENKLEEV, 1958, p. 188.
 161. P. KARYŠKOVSKIJ, 1958, p. 60.
 162. P. KARYŠKOVSKIJ, 1958, p. 63.
 163. R. KAMIENIK, 1970, pp. 96-105.
 164. M. M. SLONIMSKIJ, 1971, pp. 176 f.
 165. V. GORSKOV, 1972, p. 85.
 166. V. GORSKOV, 1972, p. 87.
 167. M. GALLACHER, 1964, p. 232; cf. on a retreat from this tendency in recent times, P. KRUŽIN, 1979, p. 3. On oblique criticism of Stalin by the Army, cf. A. AUTORCHANOV, 1959, pp. 261-274; K. SIMONOV, 1965, pp. 635 ff., 647., 662; and for possible future developments, see I. KOSINSKIJ, 1984, pp. 97-111.
 168. V. KOČETOV, 1968, p. 31. (photomechanical reprint of the edition of 1967). This book was withdrawn in the Soviet Union after the vigorous protests of the Italian Communist Party, which had been viciously maligned in it. Cf.

B. LEWIS, 1975, p. 69: "It is not for nothing that a Soviet historian once remarked that the most difficult of a historian's tasks is to predict the past". Similarly the emigrant Soviet song-writer A. A. Galič (1919-1978) in his song 'A short song with a long title' (recorded during a public concert performance in Tel-Aviv (LP-stereo 5846, side 2, song 2). It runs:

"The presumed text of my presumably delivered paper at a Congress of Historians of the Soviet block which presumably took place—if such a Congress had taken place and I had been given the honour of delivering the Opening Address at a Congress of Historians of the Soviet block:

'Half the world is drowned in blood: the times they are so hard,
And we say and we are quite correct: "Now Prince Oleg has set out,
To avenge himself on the senseless Khazars".

These noble words ring out as the note of a trumpet and we
Have all repeated them more than once,—more than once repeated—

But at a certain moment spake a highly placed Comrade:

"Once the traitor Oleg set out, to attack our brothers the Khazars."

Words come, words go,

Truth follows on Truth,

Truths vanish like snow in a thaw, and

That is why we say today:

"The time of uncertainty is over. Some Oleg

Is setting out for some reason or other

Against some Khazars or other."

In our homeland this historical method serves us by far the best. It has proved its worth. For you too it will prove its worth, for you too are sitting in the same sh...situation. It will suit you too."

[The name and first line is that of a poem of Puškin, which came out in 1822 and since then has been learned by heart by every Russian schoolchild. Author's note.]

169. ANON., 1977, p. 15.

170. M. DJILAS, 1978, pp. 217-235; S. H. BARON, 1977, pp. 13 f.

171. P. VYŠINSKIJ, 1961, cols. 393-407: "Social revolutions always have the characteristic of violence. Revolutionary violence has the task of midwife at the birth of a new social order ('formation'). The first class-conflict-ridden 'formation' in history—the slave-owner order—was undermined by the struggle of the slaves and the unprivileged plebeians, and fell apart". (This quotation from col. 395 is a paraphrase of a thesis of Stalin).

172. S. A. DRJABKIN, 1968, cols. 926-938: "The social revolution is not adequate for the whole revolutionary process in its entirety" (col. 926); "The problem of the origin of the social revolution has been only partially worked out (*sic!*) in Marxist writings...the social revolution as one of the forms in which the revolutionary process expresses itself, only comes to maturity if and when society itself has achieved a fairly high level of social organization" (col. 927); "at the heart of the ancient slave-owner society such great contrasts in the area of production and distribution come to find expression that manifold forms of struggle and of methods of resolving the conflict are brought into play, such as more or less radical reforms, civil wars conducted by the slave-owners among themselves, changes in the political form of the state, large-scale slave uprisings,...Many of these social disturbances not only resemble social revolutions when viewed from outside, but contain definite

elements of the social revolution". (col. 927). "National liberation movements, which have released a whole wave of national liberation revolutions, require very close attention. The forceful multiplicity of local conditions and the differences in the starting points cause great difficulties, which we are attempting to reduce to general terms...." (cols. 932 ff.) This is to say that the direct transition from primitive society to 'socialism' in the countries of the Third World has bewildered Soviet theoreticians to such an extent that today they fail to arrive at any clear definition, even in regard to the slave uprisings of antiquity, which 'resemble' the social revolution, or else contain 'definite features' of it, but are nevertheless not 'genuine'. Cf. E. M. ŽUKOV, 1980, pp. 125, 128-132. V. ZOTOV, 1983, pp. 15-20; M. L. GAVLIN and L. A. KAZAKOVA, 1980, in the first part of their book, (pp. 16-115, and esp. pp. 50-3, 87 f.) try to lay their objections to rest by what is often a scathing examination of Western sociologists. This interest in the Third World has led to an interest in the peripheral areas of the Ancient World: *e. g.* D. P. KALLISTOV *et al.* (edd.), 1968.

173. The disagreement between Utčenko and Štaerman on this matter is centered on the 'climax of the revolution in the 1st century BC.' Utčenko places it at the Social War, Štaerman at the Triumviral proscriptions. See ŠTAERMAN, 1966, p. 93. This means that neither Utčenko nor Štaerman sees the climax as Spartacus' uprising. For a rejection of Štaerman's case, see now V. I. KUZIŠČIN, 1980^a, p. 165.
174. See *e. g.* A. G. BOKŠČANIN, 1971, pp. 210-215 (this work is approved as a text-book for History faculties). See also JU. S. KRUSKOL, 1971, pp. 304-310. In both books the outbreak of the uprising is dated to 74 BC (in the select bibliographies (p. 479 in Bokščanin, p. 443 in Kruškol)); Mišulin's books of 1936 and 1947, and Utčenko's of 1952 are cited, as well as the essay of S. A. Žebelev and S. I. Kovalev of the year 1934 as relevant to our subject; Žebelev died in 1941 and Kovalev had disowned the work.
175. V. N. NIKIFOROV, 1968, col. 763.
176. V. I. KUZIŠČIN, 1971, col. 737; *Id.* 1976³, col. 844; *Id.*, 1983, pp. 367 f.; 370 f.
177. V. I. KUZIŠČIN, 1971, col. 739.
178. V. I. KUZIŠČIN, *ibid.* col. 740; *Id.*, 1983, p. 377. So too M. A. KOROSTOVCEV, 1975³, col. 891.
179. N. A. MAŠKIN, 1949, pp. 294-7.
180. V. I. KUZIŠČIN, 1983, pp. 364-5; 373-5; 377-8.
181. K. P. KORŽEVA, 1974, pp. 118-134.
182. N. P. KUZIN, 1980, pp. 177-192.
183. L. V. IVANOVA, 1980, pp. 10-54.
184. J. BARBER, 1981, pp. 17 f. 21 f. E. N. GORODECKIJ, 1960, pp. 85-98; G. D. ALEKSEEVA, 1965, pp. 90-116. For the intramural struggles over the collection of material, administration and writing of the history of the Revolution, cf. W. G. BURGESS, 1981.
185. S. FITZPATRICK, 1970, p. 80, quotes the Commissar for Educational Affairs, A. V. Lunačarskij: "the 'Rabfak' ('Worker-faculty') students have a pretty low opinion of their professors and mistrust them, as if to say: 'You can go on lying. We know that you are an agent of the bourgeoisie.'"

186. K. F. SHTEPPA, 1962, pp. 15 ff.; N. A. BURMISTROV, 1971, pp. 102 f.
187. A.G. PRIGOŽIN, 1933, pp. 46 f.; W. Z. RUBINSOHN, 1980, pp. 51 f.
188. See above, notes 54 and 55; also N. P. KUZIN, 1980, pp. 118, 120, 123, 133.
189. M. T. FLORINSKY, 1958, vol. II, pp. 1034-1040; for a veto on the reading of *e. g.* Plato, Thucydides and others, see R. GUL', 1979, p. 107.
190. N. P. KUZIN, 1980, p. 123; on the subsequent fate of I. I. Minc, cf. K. F. SHTEPPA, 1962, pp. 221 f., 229-234; 309 f.; A. NEKRIČ, 1979, pp. 48-53.
191. G. M. PRIGOROVSKIJ, 1928, pp. 104-6. Even the book of an anti-soviet activist *émigré* such as M. I. Rostovcev, could still be published in Leningrad in 1925.
192. J. BARBER, 1981, pp. 31-41.
193. J. BARBER, 1981, pp. 126 ff., 142-4; cf. J. V. STALIN, 1951, vol. 13, pp. 84-102. (The letters of January 1932 to Olechnovič and Aristov, *ibid.* pp. 126-132, are a continuation of this letter).
194. See above, p. 8 f.
195. ANON., 1937, pp 5-13; V. AVDIEV *et al.*, 1940, pp. 105-112; A. G. BOKŠČANIN, 1941, pp. 129-135.
196. T. ŠEPUNOVA, 1946, pp. 207-211; N. ZALESSKIJ, *ibid.* pp. 211-212.
197. ANON., 1946, p. 8.
198. See above, n. 101 and ANON., 1948^a, pp. 4 f.: "Everything that Comrades Molotov and Ždanov have said [with reference to philosophy: Author's note] is also in point on the historical front, and obliges Soviet Ancient Historians to survey their scientific luggage afresh, to investigate it more seriously, and to strengthen it by means of ideological content...So our Party calls upon Soviet Ancient Historians to unleash a relentless criticism directed at all possible expressions of kowtowing to the West and its capitalist culture, and to assure its own ideological growth". Also *ibid.* p. 10: "In what concerns methodology, Russian men of learning have always (*sic!*) surpassed foreigners...Soviet science is proud of its attainments, and has no intention of abandoning its preeminent position to bourgeois *savants*." [Translator's comment: One can only offer wry words of condolence to such victims of their own self-delusion: Revjako's misadventure (see p. 18 and footnote) has finally disposed of such bumptiousness.]
199. A. GINZBURG, 1970; P. JAKIR, 1972, *passim*; A. NEKRIČ, 1979, pp. 313 ff.

REFERENCES TO WORKS CITED IN THE ENGLISH VERSION

This reduced bibliography only includes those entries in the Select Bibliography of the German edition (pp. 49 ff.) which are actually referred to in the text of the translation. The original Select Bibliography itself runs to over 400 items, many of them found only in books and periodicals seldom accessible, if at all, even in well-stocked Western libraries; specialists who need the fuller information must have recourse to the original German edition. However a few additions to Rubinsohn's bibliography have been included here, and are distinguished by an asterisk; this seemed a convenient method of up-dating what is a very valuable bibliography, without enlarging the English version unduly. The Select bibliography of the German edition made no claim to completeness, and was only intended to smoothe the researcher's path. Under ANON. unsigned contributions are registered, mostly leading articles, which have been in all cases submitted to the Ideological Section of the Central Committee or been approved by it. These have been arranged in their order of publication.

ALEKSANDROV, G. F., 1952, J. V. Stalin o Roli Nadstroiki v Razvitii Obščestvam in: *Voprosy Filosofii* 1952 No. 1, 3-21.

*ALEKSEEVA, G. D., 1965, Sozdanie Centrov Sovetskoj Istoriceskoj Nauki i ich Dejatel'nost', in: *Istorija i Istoriki*, Moscow, 1965, 90-116.

ALEKSEEVA, G. D., 1966, in: *Očerki Istorii Istoriceskoj Nauki v SSSR*, vol. IV, Moscow, 1966.

ALEKSEEVA, G. D., 1968, Oktjabskaja Revoljucija i Istoriceskaj Nauka (1917-1923), Moscow, 1968.

*ALEKSEEVA, G. D., VANDAL'KOVSKAJA, M. G., 1974, 1974 USSR-wide Conference on Problems of Historiography, in: *Soviet Studies in History* 13 No. 1, 1974, 82-94.

ALFÖLDY, G., Römische Sozialgeschichte, Wiesbaden, 1975.

ALTMAN, V. V., KUMANEV, V. A. 1964,—(edd.), *Istorija i Sociologija*, Moscow, 1964, 15.

ANON., 1930,—in *Naučnyj Rabotnik* for October 1930, p. 5.

ANON., 1932^a,—Pamjati M. N. Pokrovskogo, in: *Soobščeniya G. A. I. M. K.* 1932 No. 5-6, 1-4.

ANON., 1932^b,—XV-Letie Oktjabrja i Naša Nauka, in: *Soobščeniya G. A. I. M. K.* 1932 No. 9-10, 1-4.

ANON., 1937,—Naši Zadači, in: *V. D. I.* 1937/1 (1), 5-13.

ANON., 1939,—Stalin i Razvitie Marksistskoj Istoriceskoj Nauki, in: *V. D. I.* 1934/4 (9), 3-15.

ANON., 1946,—Archeologija i ee rol' v Razvitii Sovetskoj Istoriceskoj Nauki, in: *V. D. I.* 1946/1 (15), 3-8.

ANON., 1947^a,—Razrabotka Drevnej Istorii v Sovetskoj Nauke (1917-1947), in: *V. D. I.* 1947/3 (21), 3-16.

ANON., 1947^b,—Problemy Izučeniya Drevnego Obščestva i Osveščenie Ikh v 'Vestnik Drevnej Istorii', in: *V. D. I.* 1947/4 (22). 3-10.

- ANON., 1948^a,—Protiv Nizkopoklonskstva Pered Inostranščinoj v Oblasti Drevnej Istorii, in: *V. D. I.* 1948/1 (23), 3-11.
- ANON., 1948^b,—Kritika i Bibliografija. IV Doktordissertationen, in: *V. D. I.* 1948/2 (24), 133 (No. 4)
- ANON., 1949^a,—Lenin i Sovetskaja Istoričeskaja Nauka, in: *V. D. I.* 1949/1 (27), 3-10.
- ANON., 1949^b,—Ob Učebnikach po Drevnej Istorii dlja Vysšej Školy, in: *V. D. I.* 1949/3 (29), 3-9.
- ANON., 1956^a,—Ulučit' Organizaciju Naučno-Issledovatel'skoj Raboty v Oblasti Drevnej Istorii, in: *V. D. I.* 1956/2 (56), 3-11.
- ANON., 1956^b,—Za Glubokoe Izučenie Jazyka Pervoistočnikov, in: *V. D. I.* 1956/3 (57), 3-6.
- ANON., 1957^a,—Za Glubokoe Ovladenie Teoretičeskim Nasladiem Lenina, in: *V. D. I.* 1957/1 (59), 3-16.
- ANON., 1957^b,—Povorotnaja Vecha v Razvitii Istoričeskoj Nauki, in: *V. D. I.* 1957/3 (61), 3-11.
- ANON., 1958,—K-10 letiju so Dnja Smerti A. V. Mišulina, in: *V. D. I.* 1958/4 (66), 170-1.
- ANON., 1960^a,—Professor Sergej Ivanovič Kovalev (1886-1960) in: *V. D. I.* 1960/4 (74), 249.
- ANON., 1960^b,—Sovetskaja Istoriografija na Novom Étape Razvitija, in: *Voprosy Istorii* 1960 No. 8, 3-18.
- ANON., 1963,—Istoričeskoe Issledovanie i Ideologija, in: *V. D. I.* 1963/3 (85), 3-10.
- ANON., 1967,—Velikaja Oktjabskoj Socialističeskoj Revoluciji i Razvitie Sovetskoy Istoričeskoj Nauki o Drevnem Mire, in: *V. D. I.* 1967/4 (102), 3-12.
- ANON., 1971,—XXIV S'ezd KPSS i Sovetskaja Istoričeskaja Nauka o Drevnem Mire, in: *V. D. I.* 1971/2 (116), 3-8.
- ANON., 1977,—60-Letie Velikoj Oktjabskoj Socialističeskoj Revolucii i Razvitie Sovetskoy Istoričeskoj Nauki o Drevnem Mire, in: *V. D. I.* 1977/4 (142), 3-16.
- ARON, P. H., 1962, M. Pokrovskij and the Impact of the First Five-Year Plan on Soviet Historiography, in: KEEF, J. S. (ed.), 1962, 283-302.
- AVDIEV, V., MAŠKIN, N., NOVICKIJ, G., 1940, Žurnal po Drevnej Istorii, in: *Bol'shevik* 1940 No. 15-16, 105-112.
- AVTORCHANOV, A., 1959, *Technologija Vlasti: Process Obrazovaniya KPSS*, Munich, 1959 (English version: Praeger, New York, 1959.)
- * AVTORCHANOV, A., 1983, Ljudoedstvo v Chleбноj Strane, *Novyj Žurnal* (= *The New Review*), 153 (Dec. 1983) 199-212.
- BACHRUŠIN, S. V., 1942/1945², Ivan Groznyj, Moscow, 1942 (1945²).
- BADIA, E., 1967, *Le Spartakisme: Les Dernières Années de Rosa Luxemburg et de K. Liebknecht, 1914-1919*, Paris, 1967.
- BARBER, J., 1981, *Soviet Historians in Crisis, 1928-1932*, Birmingham, 1981. (See also *Soviet Studies* 28/1, 1976, pp. 21-41.)
- BARG, M. A., 1980, Kategorii 'Vsemirno-Istoričeskij' i 'Lokal'no-Istoričeskij' v Marksistsko-Leninskom Istorizme, in: *Voprosy Istorii* 1980 No. 1, 61-78.

- BARON, S. H., HEER, N. W., 1971, *Politics and History in the Soviet Union*, M. I. T. Press, Boston, U.S.A., 1971 (esp. pp. 3-23).
- BARON, S. H., HEER, N. W., 1977, (ed. and Introd.), *Windows on the Russian Past: Essays on Soviet Historiography since Stalin*, Columbus, Ohio, 1977.
- BASKIN, M. P., 1936, Review of A. V. Mišulin, *Spartakovskoe Vosstanie...* (1936^b) in: *Bor'ba Klassov* 1936, No. 11, pp. 125-7.
- BASKIN, M. P., 1952, Za Tvorčeskiju Razrabotku Velikich Staliniskich Idej, in: *Voprosy Filosofii* 1952 No. 1, pp. 187-192.
- * BATALOV, E., 1983, *Lenin's Theory of Revolution*, Moscow, 1983 (Library of Political Knowledge, Book 3).
- BAŽENOV, L. V., 1931, *Klassovaja Bor'ba v Antičnom Mire*, Leningrad, 1931.
- BENKLIJEV, S. N., 1948, Chronika: Voronežskij Universitet, in: *V. D. I.* 1948/2 (24), 176-7.
- BENKLIJEV, S. N., 1958, Review of P. Karyškovskij, *Vosstanie Spartaka*, in: *V. D. I.* 1958/1 (63), 187-8.
- BEREZKIN, A., KUZNECOVA, K., 1960, *Istorija i Sovremennaja Bor'ba Ideologii*, in: *Kommunist* 1960 No. 7, 85-96.
- BERIJA, L. P., 1939, K Voprosu ob Istorii Bolševistskich Organizacij v Zakavkaz'e, Moscow, 1939⁵.
- * BICHLER, R., 1983, 'Hellenismus': Geschichte und Problematik eines Epochenbegriffs, Darmstadt, 1983.
- BLACK, C. E., 1956, (ed.), *Rewriting Russian History*, New York, 1956.
- BLAVATSKAJA, T. V., 1970, Review of V. I. Kužiščin's essay (1970^b), cited in: Anon., *Značenie Trudov V. I. Lenina dlja Izučeniija Antičnosti (Materialy Symposiuma)* in: *V. D. I.* 1970/2 (112), 20-1.
- BOGDANOV, P. S., RJAŠČENCEV, N. N., 1976, s. v. 'Spartakiada', in *B. S. E.* xxiv. 1, 846-48, Moscow, 1976³.
- BOGOLJUBOV, E. I., 1906, *Spartak*, Moscow, 1906.
- BOKŠČANIN, A. G., 1941, Vestnik Drevnej Istorii, in: *Istoričeskij Žurnal* 1941 No. 1, 129-135.
- BOKŠČANIN, A. G., KUIŽIŠČIN, V. I., 1971, (edd.) *Istorija Drevnego Rima*, Moscow, 1971.
- * BRACCO, V., 1960, Ancora sull' *Elogium* di Polla, *R. A. A. N.* 35, 1969, 149 ff.
- BRISBY, L., KEEP, J. S., 1964, (edd.) *Contemporary History in the Soviet Mirror*, London, 1964.
- * BRISSON, J. P., 1959, *Spartacus*, Paris, 1959.
- BROCKMEYER, N., 1979, *Antike Sklaverei*, Darmstadt, 1979.
- BURFORD, A., 1972, *Craftsmen in Greek and Roman Society*, London, 1972.
- * BURGESS, W. F., 1981, *The ISTPART Commission: the Historical Department of the Russian CP Central Committee, 1920-1928*, Yale Univ. Ph. D. Thesis, 1981.
- BURIAN, J., 1960, Zpracování Spartakova Povstání v Sovetské Historické Literature, in: *Acta Univers. Carolinae—Philosophica et Historica Graecolatina Pragensia* I, No. 4, 1960, 3-25.

- * BURMISTROV, N. A., 1968, K Probleme Partijnosti Istoričeskoj Nauki, in: *Voprosy Istorigrafii Vseobščej Istorii*, Vypusk 3, 1968, 14-33.
- * BURMISTROV, N. A., 1971, Stanovlenie Sovetskogo Škol'nogo Učebnika po Istorii Drevnego Mira, in: *Voprosy Istorigrafii Vseobščej Istorii*, Vypusk 5, 1971, 102-116.
- ČERKASOV, N. K., 1953, Zapiski Aktera, Moscow, 1953.
- ČERNILOVSKIJ, Z., 1960, M., Istorija Rabovladel'českogo Gosudarstva i Prava, Moscow, 1960².
- * CONQUEST, R., 1968, The Great Terror, London, 1968.
- CRUMMEY, R. O., 1977, Ivan the Terrible, in: HEER, N. W., (edd.) 1977, 57-74.
- ČUKOVSKAJA, L., 1979, Process Isključenija (Očerak Literaturnych Nravov), Paris, 1979.
- ČUGUNOV, T. K., 1968, Derevnja na Golfoge. Letopis' Kommunističeskich Epochi: ot 1917 do 1967 goda, Munich, 1968.
- DANILOVA, L. V., 1968, Diskussionnye Istorii Dokapitalističeskich Obščestv, in: *Problemy Istorii Dokapitalističeskich Obščestv*, Moscow, 1968, vol. I, 27-66.
- * DEMIDOV, A. I., 1984, Leninskaja Kritika Teorii Stichijnosti i Sovremennost', Moscow, 1984.
- DILIGENSKIJ, G. G., (1961^a), Problemy Istorii Antičnogo Rabstva, in: *V. D. I.* 1961/2 (76), 124-37.
- DILIGENSKIJ, G. G., (1961^b) MARINVIČ, L. P., Izučenie Istorii Antičnogo Mira v 1956-1960 gg., in: *V. D. I.* 1961/4 (78), 17-31.
- DILIGENSKIJ, G. G., (1963) MARINVIČ, L. P., in: Družinin, N. M. et al. (edd.), Sovetskaja Istoričeskaja Nauka ot XX k XXII S'ezdu KPSS, Moscow, 1963, 5-25.
- DJILAS, M., 1978, Ideologia Pišet Istoriju, in: *Kontinent* 15, 1978, 217-36.
- * DOI, M., 1985, Methods for Viewing World History from the Perspective of the Ruled, in: *Papers of the International Symposium for Studies on Ancient Worlds* Jan. 1986 (Tokyo, 1985, pp. 1-21.
- DOROŠENKO, V. A., 1966, Obrazovanie i Osnovnye Etapy Dejat'nosti Obščestva Istorikov-Marksistov (1925-1932), in: *Vestnik Moskovskogo Universiteta* 1966 No. 3, 10-22.
- DRJABKIN, S. A., 1968, s. v. Social'naja Revoljucija, in: *S. I. E.* XI, 926-38, Moscow, 1968.
- * DROYSEN, J. G., 1937, Historik, Munich, 1937⁵ (reprinted 1967).
- * DROZDOV, P., 1937, in: *Pravda* for 27 March 1937.
- DUBROVSKIJ, S. M., 1962, Akademik M. N. Pokrovskij i ego Rol' v Razvitii Sovetskoi Istoričeskoj Nauki in: *Voprosy Istorii* 1962 No. 3, 3-40.
- D'JAKOV, V. N., NIKOL'SKIJ, N. M., 1952, Istorija Drevnego Mira, Moscow, 1952.
- EFIMOV, A., 1975, Social Structures and their Modifications, in: *Problems of the Contemporary World*, No. 32, Moscow, 1975, 18-44.
- * ENGEL, J., 1959, Die deutschen Universitäten und die Geschichtswissenschaft, in: *Historische Zeitschrift* 189, 1959, 223-378.
- * ENGELBERG, E. et al., 1974, Genese und Gültigkeit von Epochenbegriffen: theoretisch-methodologische Prinzipien der Periodisierung, Berlin, 1974.

- ENTEEN, G. M., 1969, Soviet Historians Review their own Past: the Rehabilitation of M. N. Pokrovsky, in: *Soviet Studies* 20/3, 1969, 306-320.
- ENTEEN, G. M., 1969, M. N. Pokrovskij and the Administration of Soviet Historical Scholarship, in: *Jahrbuch für Geschichte Osteuropas* 22, 1974, vol. 1, 56-67.
- *ETKIND, E., 1981, *Unblutige Hinrichtung*, Munich, 1981.
- FAINSOD, M., 1964, Historiography and Change, in: Keep, J. S., Brisby, L. (edd.) *Contemporary History in the Soviet Mirror*, New York, 1964, 19-42.
- FEDJUKIN, S. A., 1960, V. I. Lenin i Problema Privlečenija Buržuaznyh Specialistov Socialističeskomu Stroitel'stvu v Pervye Gody Sovetskoj Vlasti, in: *Istorija SSSR* 1960 No. 2, 90-111.
- FINLEY, M. I., 1973, *Ancient Slavery and Modern Ideology*, London, 1973 (German translation: *Die Sklaverei in der Antike*, Munich, 1981).
- FITZPATRICK, S., 1970, The Commissariat of Enlightenment: Soviet Organization of Education and the Arts under Lunacharsky, Cambridge, 1970.
- *FITZPATRICK, S., 1979, *Education and Social Mobility in the Soviet Union, 1921-1934*, Cambridge, 1979.
- FLORINSKY, M. T., 1958, *Russia, a History and an Interpretation*, New York, 1958.
- FOCHT, A. V., 1940, Ošibki M. N. Pokrovskogo v Voprosach Prepodavanija Istorii, in: *Protiv Antimarksistskoj koncepcii M. N. Pokrovskogo*, Moscow-Leningrad, 1940, vol. II, 486-506.
- FRAYN, J. M., 1979, *Subsistence Farming in Roman Italy*, London, 1979.
- GALLACHER, M., 1964, Trends in Soviet Historiography of the Second World War, in: KEEP, J. S., BRISBY, L., (edd.), 1964, 222-42.
- GANSHOF, F. L., 1960, *Feudalism*, London, 1960.
- GARNSEY, P., 1980, (ed.), *Non-slave Labour in the Greco-Roman World*, Cambridge, 1980.
- GAVLIN, M. L., KAZAKOVA, L. A., 1980, *Sovremennye Buržuaznye Teorii Social'noj Revoljucii*, Moscow, 1980.
- GELLNER, E., 1974, The Soviet and the Savage, *T. L. S.*, 18 Oct. 1974, 1166-1168.
- *GINZBURG, A. (ed.), 1970, *Belaja Kniga po Delu A. Sinjavskogo i Ju. Daničlja*, Frankfurt-am-Main, 1970.
- *GINZBURG, B. E., 1979, *Krutoj Maršrut*, Milan, 1979, vol. 2, p. 162.
- GOLUBCOVA, E. S., 1977^a in: *V. D. I.* 1977/1 (129).
- GOLUBCOVA, E. S., 1977^b *Izučenie Istorii Drevnego Rima v Sovetskoj Istorigrafii* 60-ch—70ch godov, in: *V. D. I.* 1977/4 (142) 57-72.
- *GORJAČEVA, A. I., BLIJUM, R. N., REBANE, JA. K., Review of B. F. Poršnev, *Social'naja Psihologija i Istorija*, in: *Voprosy Filosofii* 1967 No. 7, 156-159.
- *GORODECKIJ, E. N., 1960, K Charakteristike Istorigrafii Velikoj Oktjabrskoj Socialističeskoj Revoljucii, in: *Istorija SSSR* 1960 No. 6, 85-98.
- GORODECKIJ, E. N., 1976, Historiography as a Special Branch of Historical Science, in: *Soviet Studies in History* 14, No. 4, 1976, 3-39.

- GORSKOV, V., 1972, Voennoe Iskustvo Spartaka, in: *Voennoe-Istoričeskij Žurnal*, 1972, No. 8, 82-7.
- GUARINO, A., 1980, Spartakus: Analyse eines Mythos, Munich, 1980.
- GUL', R., 1979, *The New Review* 134, 1979, p. 107.
- GUTNOVA, E. V., 1967, Sovetskaja Medievistika s Serediny 30^{kh} gg. do 1966 goda, Toms'kij GU, Trudy, vol. 193, 1967, 370-456.
- * HAHN, W. G., 1982, Postwar Soviet Politics. The Fall of Zhdanov and the Defeat of Moderation, 1946-1953, Cornell U. P., 1982.
- HEER, N. W., 1973, Politics and History in the Soviet Union, MIT Press, 1971 (Public edn. 1973),
- * HEGEL, G. W. F., (1956), The Philosophy of History, repr. Dover Publications, New York, 1956.
- HEINEN, H., 1980, (ed. and Introd.), Die Geschichte des Altertums im Spiegel der sowjetischen Forschung, Darmstadt, 1980.
- HOBBSAWM, E. J., 1973, Revolutionaries, London, 1973 (repr. 1977).
- * HOBBSAWM, E. J., 1984, Marx and History, *New Left Review*, 143, 1984, pp. 39-50.
- IVANOVA, L. V., 1980, Formirovanie Sovetskoy Naučnoj Intelligencii 1917-1927, Moscow, 1980.
- JAKIR, P., 1972, Detstvo v Tjur'me. Memuary Petra Jakira, London, 1972.
- * JAN, V. G., 1952 (1964), Spartak, Moscow-Leningrad, 1952 (repr. in: id. *Finikijskij Korabl'. Spartak. Istoričeskije Povesti*, Moscow, 1964).
- JAROSLAVSKIJ, EM., 1939, Nevypolnennye Zadači Istoričeskogo Fronta, in *Istoričeskij Marksist* vol. IV, 74, 1939, 3-11.
- JAROSLAVSKIJ, EM., 1940, Antimarksistkie Izvraščeniya i Vul'garizatorstvo tak Nazyvaemoj 'Školy' Pokrovskogo', in: *Protiv Antimarksistskoj Konceptcii...*, Moscow-Leningrad, 1940, vol. II, 5-24.
- * JÜNGER, H., 1966 (Engl. edn. 1970), Literaturen der Völker der Sowjetunion, Leipzig, 1966 (cited from the English edition, New York, 1970).
- KAC, A. L., 1967, Problema Padeniya Rimskoj Imperii v Sovetskoy Istoriografii (Iz Istarii Voprosa), in: *V. D. I.* 1967/2, (100), 212-229.
- KALLISTOV, D. P., 1968, *et al.* (edd.), Rabstvo na Periferii Antičnogo Mira, Leningrad, 1968.
- KAMIENIK, R., 1970, Die Zahlenangaben über den Spartacus-Aufstand und ihre Glaubwürdigkeit, in: *Das Altertum*, 16, 1970, 96-105.
- * KARYŠKOVSKIJ, P., 1958, Vosstanie Spartaka, Moscow, 1958.
- KEEP, J. S., (1962), (ed.) Essays in Russian and Soviet History, New York, 1962.
- KEEP, J. S., (1964), BRISBY, L. (edd.), Contemporary History in the Soviet Mirror, London, 1964.
- KIM, S. R., 1979, K Voprosu o Transformacii Antagonističeskich Klassov v Rimskom Obščestve. Pozdnijaja Respublika, in: Piotrovskij, B. B. *et al.* (edd.), *Problemy Antičnoj Istarii i Kul'tury*, Erevan, 1979, vol. I, 366-71.
- KOČETOV, V., 1968, Čego že Ty Chočeš', London, 1968.
- * KOCEVALOV, A. S., 1956, Antičnoe Rabstvo i Revoljucija Rabov v Sovetskoy Istoričeskoy Literature, Munich, 1956.

- KOLOBOVA, K. M., 1967, Vosstanija Rabov v Antičnom Obščestve V-I. vv. do n.e. (Istoriografičeskij Očerok), in: Revunenkov, V. G. (ed.), *Problemy Vseobščej Istorii*, Leningrad, 1967, 5-28.
- KONRAD, N. I., 1966, Zapad i Vostok, Moscow, 1966.
- * KOPRŽIVA-LURIA, B. YA., Istoriya Odnog Žizni, Paris, Athenaeum, 1987 (The Story of One Life, a biography of Salomo Luria, by his sister: see n. 54)
- KOROSTOVCEV, M. A., 1942, Izučenie Istorii Drevnego Mira za 25 Let, in: Tarle, G. JA., et al., 1942.
- KOROSTOVCEV, M. A., 1962, A. S. Svanidze (K 25-Letiju ego Smerti), in: *V. D. I.* 1962/2 (80), 119-21.
- KOROSTOVCEV, M. A., 1975, s. v. Rabovladel'českij Stroj, in: *B. S. E.*, XXI, 299-302, Moscow, 1975³.
- KORSUNSKIJ, A. R., 1964, Problema Revoljucionnogo Perechoda ot Rabovladel'českogo Stroja k Feodal'nomu... in: *Voprosy Istorii* 1964 No. 5, 219-42.
- KORŽEVA, K. P., 1964, Problema Krušenija Antičnogo Rabstva v Sovetskoj Istoriografii, in: *Učenyje Trudy Kazachskogo Universiteta*, Alma-Ata, 1964, 219-42.
- KORŽEVA, K. P., 1971, Das Probleme der Dekadenz und des Untergangs der römischen Republik in der sowjetischen Historiographie, in: *Acta Conventus Eirene* XI, 1971, 147-60.
- KORŽEVA, K. P., 1974, Vosstanie Spartaka v Sovetskoj Istoriografii, in *Voprosy Istorii* 1974 No. 10, 118-134 (German version in: *Klio* 61 (1979) 477-96).
- * KOSINSKIJ, I., 1984, V perspektive voennaja diktatura, Vremja i My 78 (1984), pp. 97-111.
- KOVALEV, S. I., Problema Social'noj Revoljucii v Antičnom Obščestve, in: *I. G. A. I. M. K.* No. 90, 1934, pp. 285-328.
- KOVALEV, S. I., 1936, Istorija Antičnogo Obščestva; Ellinizm. Rim, Leningrad, 1936.
- KOVALEV, S. I., 1947a, Dve Problemy Rimskoj Istorii, in: *Vestnik Leningradskogo Universiteta* 1947 No. 4, 86-99.
- KOVALEV, S. I., 1947b, 10 Let Vestnika Drevnej Istorii: Privetstvija, in: *V. D. I.* 1974/4 (22), 115-6.
- KOVALEV, S. I., 1957, Sorok Let Sovetskoj Istoriografii po Drevnemu Rimu, in: *V. D. I.* 1957/3 (61), 42-54.
- * KRAPIVENSKIJ, S. E., 1967, Perekhod k Feodalizmu kak social'naya revolyucija, Tomskij GU, Trudy, vol. 193, 1967, 52-75.
- KRIVOGUZ, I. M., 1962, 'Spartak' i Obrazovanie Kommunističeskoj Partii Germanii, Moscow, 1962.
- KRJUGER, O. O., 1934, Rabskie Vosstanija II-I vv. do n.e. kak Načal'nyj Étap Revoljucii Rabov, in: *Izvestija G. A. I. M. K.* No. 76, 1934, 111-31, 163-221.
- KROTKOV, JU., 1978, Konec Maršala Berija, in: *The New Review* 133, 1978, 212-232.
- KRUŠKOL, JU. S., 1971, (ed.), Istorija Drevnego Mira, vol. II, Moscow, 1971.
- KRUŽIN, P., 1979, Voenizdat—K Stoletiju So Dnja Roždenija Stalina, in *Russkaja Mysl'* No. 3272, 6 September 1979, 3.

- KUBLANOV, M., 1964, Sergei Ivanovič Kovalev (1886-1960), in: S. I. Kovalev, *Osnovnye Voprosy Proischozhenija Christiansstva*, Leningrad, 1964, 5-20.
- KUDRJAVCEV, O. V., 1954, Ėllinskie Provincii Balkanskogo Poluostrova vo 2. v. n. e., Moscow, 1954.
- KUDRJAVCEV, O. V., 1957, Issledovanija po Istorii Balkansko-Dunajskich Oblastej v Period Rimskoj Imperii i Stat'i po Obščim Problemam Drevnej Istorii, Moscow, 1957, 257-308 (Problema Periodizacii Istorii Rabovladel'českogo Obščestva).
- * KURNASOV, A. A., 1965, Bor'ba Sovetskikh Ljudej v Tylu Nemecko-Fašistskich Okkupantov (Istoriografija Voprosa) in: *Istorija i Istoriki*, Moscow, 1965, 169-193.
- KUZIN, N. P., 1966, (1980²), (ed.) Očerki Istorii Šoly i Pedagogičeskoj Mysli Narodov S.S.S.R., 1917-1941 gg. Moscow, 1966.
- KUZIŠČIN, V. I., 1966, Očerki po Istorii Sel'skogo Chozjajstva Drevnej Italii II. do n.e.-II v. n.e., Moscow, 1966.
- KUZIŠČIN, V. I., 1970^a, Problemy Proizvoditel'nosti Rabskogo Truda, Moscow, 1970.
- KUZIŠČIN, V. I., 1970^b, Problemy Periodizacii Obščestvenno-Ėkonomičeskoj Formacii v Proizvedenijach V. I. Lenina, Resumé in: ANON., *V. D. I.* 1970/2 (112), 13-6.
- KUZIŠČIN, V. I., 1971, s. v. Spartaka Vosstanie, in: *S. I. E. XIII*, 737-740, Moscow, 1971.
- KUZIŠČIN, V. I., 1976, in: *B. S. E. XXIV*. 1, p. 286, col. 844, Moscow, 1976³.
- KUZIŠČIN, V. I., 1980^a, Rezension über E. M. Štaerman, *Drevnij Rim*, in: *V. D. I.* 1980/2 (152), 156-66.
- KUZIŠČIN, V. I., 1980^b, (ed.) Istoriografija Antičnoj Istorii, Moscow, 1980.
- * KUZIŠČIN, V. I., 1983, Spartak—Vožd' Vosstavšich Rabov, Polkovodec, Čelovek, in: *V. Leskov, Spartak*, Moscow, 1983, 364-378.
- LABEDZ, L., 1957, Soviet Historiography between the Thaw and the Freeze, in: *Soviet Survey*, May 1957, 1-13.
- LENIN, V. I., 1949, Polnoe Sobranie Sočinenij, 1949 and following years. (Cited from the 4th and 5th editions: the 3rd edn. was withdrawn from circulation in the Soviet Union).
- * LESKOV, V., 1983, Spartak, Moscow, 1983.
- LEWIS, B., 1975, History Remembered, Recovered, Invented, Princeton U. P., 1975.
- MAŠKIN, N. A., (1939), Spornye Voprosy Istorii Drevnego Mira, in: *Istoriik-Marxist* 74, 1939, 77-84.
- MAŠKIN, N. A., (1947), *Istorija Drevnego Rima*, Leningrad, 1947 (German version: Berlin [East], 1953).
- MAŠKIN, N. A., (1949), Principat Augusta, Moscow-Leningrad, 1949.
- MCNEILL, T., Historiography Belies History: The CPSU Remakes the Past, Radio Liberty Research 172/77, 1-20.
- MEHNERT, T., 1952, Stalin versus Marx: Stalinist Historical Doctrine, New York/London, 1952 (reprinted 1972). (German edn., *Weltrevolution durch Weltgeschichte—Die Geschichtslehre des Stalinismus*, Stuttgart, 1953²).
- MEYER, E. (ed.), 1927, Spartakus im Kriege. Die Illegalen Flugblätter des Spartakusverbandes im Kriege, Berlin, 1927.

- MICHAILOV, A., 1927, Spartak, Moscow, 1927.
- * MILJUKOV, P., 1937, Veličie i Padenie M. N. Pokrovskogo, in: *Sovremennye Zapiski* 65, 1937, 368-87.
- MIŠULIN, A. V., (1934^a), Vosstanie Spartaka v Antičnom Mire, in: *I. G. A. I. M. K.* No. 76, 1934, 132-62.
- MIŠULIN, A. V., (1934^b), Drevnjaja Istorija v Srednej i Vysšej Školy, in: *Bor'ba Klassov* No. 5-6, 1934, 9-15.
- MIŠULIN, A. V., (1935), Poslednij Pochod Spartaka i ego Gibel', in: *Problemy Istorii Dokapitalističeskich Obščestv*, 1935, No. 7-8, 116-133.
- MIŠULIN, A. V., (1936^a), Revoljucii Rabov i Padenie Rimskoj Respubliki, Moscow, 1936.
- MIŠULIN, A. V., (1936^b), Spartakovskoe Vosstanie: Revoljucija Rabov v Drevnem Rime v I v do n. e., Moscow, 1936.
- MIŠULIN, A. V., (1937), K Istorii Vosstanija Spartaka v Drevnem Rime, in: *V. D. I.* 1937/1 (1), 133-42.
- MIŠULIN, A. V., (1938^a), Sovetskaja Istoriografija i Zadači Drevnej Istorii, in: *V. D. I.* 1938/1 (2), 3-12.
- MIŠULIN, A. V., (1938^b), Neocenennyj Vklad v Marksistskiju Istoričeskiju Nauku, in: *V. D. I.* 1938/3 (4), 17-24. (German translation: *Ein unschätzbarer Beitrag zur marxistischen historischen Wissenschaft*).
- MIŠULIN, A. V., (1938^c), O Nasledstve Russkoj Nauki po Drevnej Istorii, in: *V. D. I.* 1938/4 (4), 25-35.
- MIŠULIN, A. V., (1939), Iz Laboratorii Istoričeskich Idej Lenina, in: *V. D. I.* 1939/4 (9), 16-29.
- MIŠULIN, A. V., (1947), s. v. Spartak, in: *B. S. E.* LII, 368-70, 1947.
- * MOGIL'NICKIJ, B. G., 1967, Obektivnost' Istoričeskogo Poznanija i Sovremennost', in: *Tomskij Gos. Univ. Trudy*, vol. 193 (1967) pp. 30-51.
- MOTUS-BEKKER, A. A., 1948, Iz Istorii Vosstanija Spartaka, in: *Učenyje Zapiski Leningradskogo Pedagogičeskogo Instituta*, Vypusk 68, 1948, 55-78.
- * MÜLLER, E., 1905, Spartakus und der Sklavenkrieg in Geschichte und Dichtung, Schulprogramm Salzburg, 1905.
- * MUSZKAT-MUSZKOWSKI, 1909, Spartakus: Eine Stoffgeschichte, Leipzig, 1909.
- NARDIN, V. V., 1972, Basic Questions of M. N. Pokrovski's view of History, in: *Soviet Studies in History*, 11 No. 2, 1972, 155-77.
- NEČKINA, M. V., (1960^a), O Periodizacii Istorii Sovetskoj Istoričeskoj Nauki, in: *Istorija SSSR* 1960 No. 1, 77-91.
- NEČKINA, M. V., KIM, S. R., (1960^b), V. I. Lenin o Roli Narodnych Mass v Istorii, in: *Istorija SSSR* 1960, No. 2, 3-21.
- NEČKINA, M. V., POLJAKOV, JU., ČEREPNIN, L. V., (1961), Nekotoryje Voprosy Istorii Sovetskoj Istoričeskoj Nauki, in: *Kommunist* 1961, No. 9, 58-70.
- NEČKINA, M. V., (1962), K Itogam Diskussii o Periodizacii Istorii Sovetskoj Istoričeskoj Nauki, in: *Istorija SSSR* 1962, No. 2, 57-78.
- NEDEL'SKIJ, V. I., 1931, K Voprosu o Charaktere Vozniknovenija Christianstva, in: *Voinstvujuščij Ateizm* 1931, No. 2-3, 158-88.
- NEKRIČ, A., 1979, Otrešis ot Stracha. Vospominanija Istorika, London, 1979.
- NIKIFOROV, V. N., 1968, s. v. Rabovledel'českij Stroj, in: *S. I. E.* XI, 762-8, Moscow, 1952.

- * PADGUG, R. A., 1976, Problems of the Theory of Slavery and Slave Society, in: *Science and Society*, 40, 1976, pp. 3-27.
- PANKRATOVA, A. M., 1939, Razvitie Istoričeskich Vzgljadov M. N. Pokrovskogo, in: *Protiv Antimarksistkoj koncepcii M. N. Pokrovskogo*, Moscow-Leningrad, 1939, vol. I, 5-69.
- * PARAIN, Ch., 1953, Chronique d'histoire de l'antiquité, sur la revolution des esclaves, in: *La Pensée* 46, 1953, 103-110.
- * PASUTO, V. T., SALOV, V. I., ČEREPNIN, L. V., Marksistsko-Leninskij Princip Partijnosti v Istoričeskom Issledovanii i Ego Sovremennye Kritiki, in: *Aktual'nye Problemy Istorii Rossii Epochi Feodalizma*, Moscow, 1970, 39-63.
- * PATTERSON, O., 1979, On slavery and slave formations, *New Left Review*, 117, 1979, pp. 31-67.
- PAVLOVSKAJA, A. I., 1979, Les Recherches des historiens soviétiques sur l'esclavage en Grèce et dans le monde hellénistique, in: *Actes du Colloque sur l'esclavage*, Nieborow 2-6. XII. 1975, Warsaw, 1979, 23-33.
- PEDOSOV, A. D., ZEVELEV, A. I., 1973, Review of Sokolov, O. D., *Pokrovskij, M. N.*, in: *Soviet Studies in: History* No. 12, 1973, 83-9.
- PETERS, D. D., 1940, Vosstanie Spartaka, in: *Ža Kommunističeskoe Prosveščenie* 1940 No. 12, 57-69.
- PETIT, P., 1970, L'esclavage antique dans l'historiographie soviétique in: *Actes du Coll. Hist. Soc.*, 1970, Paris, 1972, 9-27.
- POKROVSKIJ, M. N., 1972, Bor'ba Klassov i Russkaja Istoričeskaja Literatura, Leningrad, 1972².
- PORŠNEV, B. F., 1962, Social'naja Psihologija i Istorija, Moscow, 1966.
- * PORŠNEV, B. F., 1975, Rol' Social'nych Revolyucij v Smene Formacij, in: E. M. ŽUKOV, 1975^b, 25-39.
- PREOBRAŽENSKIJ, P. F., (1936), Review of A. V. Mišulin, *Spartakovskoe Vosstanie* in: *Istoričeskij Marksist* 6, 1936, 206-7.
- PREOBRAŽENSKIJ, P. F., (1965), V Mire Antičnyh Idej i Obrazov, Moscow, 1965.
- PRIGOROVSKIJ, G. M., 1928, Drevnjaja Istorija, in: V. P. Volgin *et al.* (edd), *Obščestvennye Nauki S.S.S.R.*, 1917-27, Moscow, 1928, 101-106.
- PRIGOŽIN, A. G., 1933, K. Marks i Problemy Dokapitalističeskich Formacij, Moscow-Leningrad, 1933.
- PRIGOŽIN, A. G., 1934, Gibel' Antičnogo Mira i Problema Social'noj Revoljucii v Antičnosti, in: *Izvestija G. A. I. M. K.* No. 76, 1934, 7-26.
- PUTILOVSKIJ, M. P., 1929, Spartak, Vožd' Vosstavšich Rabov, Moscow, 1929.
- PUTNYN', E. K., 1959, Istorija Ideologičeskoj Bor'by v Oblasti Drevnej Istorii (1917-1924), in: *Učenyje Zapiski Saratovskogo Universiteta, Serija Istoričeskaja*, No. 68, 1959, 171-190.
- RACHMANOVA, R. M., 1972, Nekotorye Voprosy Istorii Drevnego Mira v Naučnom Nasledii V. I. Lenina, in: *Naučnye Trudy Taškentskogo Universiteta*, Vypusk 423, 1972, 9-22.
- * RADER, M., 1979, The Marxist Interpretation of History, Oxford University Press, 1979².
- RAKOV, L. L., 1933, K Probleme Razloženiya Rabovladel'českoj Formacii, in: *Izvestija G. A. I. M. K.* no. 66, 1933, 3-50.
- RASKOLNIKOFF, M., 1975, La recherche en Union Soviétique et l'histoire économique et sociale du monde hellénistique et romain, Strasbourg, 1975.

- RAUCH, G. K., VON, 1962, *Istorija Sovetskoj Rossii*, New York, 1962 (Russian translation), German version in: *Geschichte der UdSSR*, Stuttgart, 1977⁶.
- * REVJAKO, K. A., 1981, O Vystupenijach Rabov Rimskoj Respubliki (V-I vv. do n. o.) in: *Voprosy Istorii*, Vypusk 8, Minsk, 1981, 107-113.
- ROSENFELDT, N. E., 1980, Paradigms of Periodization, Vortrag, Garmisch, 1980.
- ROSTOVZEV, M. I., (1925), *Skifija i Bosfor*, Leningrad, (pre-1925).
- RUBINSOHN, W. Z., 1980, Saumakos: Ancient History, Modern Politics, in: *Historia*, 29, 1980, 50-70.
- RÜHLE, J., 1983, *Literatur und Revolution*, Munich, 1963 (English translation: *Literature and Revolution*, London, 1969).
- RUTYČ, N., 1960, KPSS u Vlasti. Očerki po Istorii Kommunističeskoj Partei, 1917-1957, Frankfurt-a-Main. 1960.
- SAMUEL, R., 1980, British Marxist Historians, 1880-1980, *New Left Review*, 120, 1980, pp.21-96.
- SCHMIDT, A., 1981, *History and Structure: an Essay on Hegelian-Marxist and Structuralist Theories of History*, M.I.T.Press, Boston, U.S.A., 1981.
- ŠEPUNOVA, T., 1946, Naučnaja Rabota Kafedry Drevnej Istorii Istoričeskogo Fakul'teta M. G. U. (1939-1945), in: *V. D. I.* 1946/2 (16), 207-211.
- * SERGEENKO, M. I., 1958, Očerki po Sel'skomu Chozjajstvu Drevnej Italii, Moscow-Leningrad, 1958.
- * SERGEEV, V. S., 1935, Revoljucija Rabov v Rimskoj Respublike, in: *Bor'ba Klassov*, No. 6, 1935, p. 86, 95.
- SERGIEVSKIJ, G., 1936, Cennyj, no Syroj Trud o Revoljucii Rabov, in: *Kniga i Proletarskaja Revoljucija* 1936 No. 7, 63-71.
- SHTEPPE, K. F., 1962, *Russian Historians and the Soviet State*, New Jersey, 1962.
- S(H)TEPPA, H. P., 1934, Problema Klassovoj Bor'by v Antičnoj Formacii za Marksom ta Engel'som, in: *Naukovi Zapiski AN USSR*, Institut Istorii Material'noj Kul'tury (Kiev) I, 1934, 103-123.
- SIDOROV, A. L., 1955, Hauptprobleme und einige Entwicklungsergebnisse der sowjetischen Geschichtswissenschaft, in: *Relazioni del X Congresso Internaz. di Sc. Storiche*, Rome, 1955, Florence 1955, vol. VI, 389-451.
- * SIMONOV, K., 1965, *Soldatami ne Roždajutsja*, Moscow, 1965.
- SKAZKINA, S. D., 1977, *et al.* (edd.) *Istorija Srednich Vekov*, Moscow, 1977 (2 vols.).
- SLONIM, M., 1977, *Soviet Russian Literature: Writers and Problems 1917-1977*, Oxford, 1977².
- SLONIMSKIJ, M. M., 1971, Čislennost' Povstančeskoj Armii Spartaka, in: *Voprosy Istorii* 1971 No. 12, 176-7.
- ŠMIDT, S. O., 1962, O Predmete Sovetskoj Istorioigrafii i o Nekotorych Principach ee Periodizacii, in: *Istorija SSSR* 1962 No. 1, 94-104.
- * ŠOFMAN, A. S., WUL'FSON, G. N., 1968, Istoričeskaja Nauka v Sisteme Obščestvennych Nauk, in: *Voprosy Istorioigrafii Vseobščej Istorii*, Vypusk 3, 1968 (Kazan'), 3-13.
- * ŠOFMAN, A. S., 1971, Problemy Antičnoj Istorii v Naučnom Nasledii V. I. Lenina, in: *Voprosy Istorioigrafii Vseobščej Istorii*, Vypusk 5, 1971 (Kazan') 15-44.
- * ŠOFMAN, A. S., 1981, A. V. Mišulin kak Istorik Antičnosti, in: *Istoriya i Istoriki* 1981, Moscow, 1985, 184-204.

- SOLOV, O. D., 1972, M. N. Pokrovskij i Sovetskaja Istoričeskaja Nauka, Moscow, 1970.
- ŠTAERMAN, E. M., KOVALEV, S. I., 1956^a, Očerki Istorii Drevnego Rima, Moscow, 1956 (handed to printer on 6 January).
- ŠTAERMAN, E. M., 1956^b, Krizis Respubliki: Velikoe Vosstanie Rabov pod Rukovodstvom Spartaka, in: S. L. Utčenko (ed.), *Vsemirnaja Istorija*, vol. II, Moscow, 1956, 366-71 (German translation in: *Weltgeschichte*, Berlin [East], 1962, vol. II, 375-9.)
- ŠTAERMAN, E. M., 1964, Rascvet Rabovladel'českich Otnošenij v Rimskoj Respublike, Moscow, 1964 (German translation: *Die Blütezeit der Sklavenwirtschaft in der Römischen Republik*, Wiesbaden, 1969).
- ŠTAERMAN, E. M., 1966, Problemy Padenija Rimskoj Respubliki v Sovetskoj Istorioigrafii, in: *Voprosy Istorii* 1966 No. 41/3, 83-93.
- ŠTAERMAN, E. M., 1968, Antičnoe Obščestvo: Modernizacija Istorii i Istoričeskie Analogii, in: *Problemy Istorii Dokapitalističeskich Obščestv*, Moscow, 1968, 638-71.
- ŠTAERMAN, E. M., 1971, Die Bedeutung der Werke Lenins für die Erforschung der Antike, in: *Klio* 53, 1971, 5-47.
- ŠTAERMAN, E. M., 1978^a, Drevnij Rim: Problemy Ėkonomičeskogo Razvitija, Moscow, 1978.
- * ŠTAERMAN, E. M., 1978^b, S. L. ŪTČENKO (1908-1976) in: *Eirene* 16, 1978, 99-101.
- STALIN, J. V., 1951, Sočinenija, Moscow, 1951.
- STROBEL, G. W., 1974, Die Partei Rosa Luxemburgs, Lenin und die S. P. D., Wiesbaden, 1974.
- * STAMPACCHIA, G., 1976, La Tradizione della Guerra di Spartaco da Sallustio a Orosio, Pisa, 1976.
- ŠVEDOVA, O. I., 1941, Istoriki SSSR: Ukazatel' Pečatnych Spiskov ich Trudov, Moscow, 1941.
- * SVETOV, F., 1985, Opyt Biografii, Paris, 1985.
- SWAYZE, H., 1962, Political Control of Literature in the U.S.S.R. (1946-1959), Cambridge, Mass. 1962.
- TARLE, G., 1942, JA., VOLGIN, V. P., PANKRATOVA, A. M., (edd.), 25 Let Istoričeskoj Nauki v SSSR, Moscow, 1942.
- TJUMENEV, A. I., 1957, Izučenie Istorii Drevnej Grecii v S.S.S.R. za 15 Let (1917-1957), in: *V. D. I.* 1957/3 (61), 28-41.
- * TRAUKINA, I. (ed.), 1975, Questions of the Methodology of History, Moscow, 1975, pp. 5-44.
- * TURKINA, L. G., 1969, K Voprosu ob Osveščeenii Krizisa i Padenija Rimskoj Respubliki v Sovetskoj Istorioigrafii, in: *Nekotorye Voprosy Vseobščej Istorii*, Čeljabinsk, 1969, 3-21.
- URBAN, P. K., 1962, O Reabilitaciji Pokrovskogo, in: *Materialy i Soobščeniya*, Institut po Izučeniju SSSR, No. 40, Munich, 1962, 31-42.
- * ŪTČENKO, S. L., 1951, O Klassach i Klassovoj Strukture Antičnogo Rabovladel'českogo Obščestva, in: *V. D. I.* 1951/4 (38), pp. 15-21.
- ŪTČENKO, S. L., 1952^a, Die Historische Bedeutung des Spartacusaufstandes, in: A. W. Mischulin, *Spartacus, Abriss der Geschichte des Grossen Sklavenaufstandes*, Berlin (East), 1952^a, 5-12.

- UTČENKO, S. L., 1952^b, Idejno-Političeskaja Bor'ba v Rime Nakanune Padenija Rimskoj Respubliki, Moscow, 1952^b (German translation: *Der weltanschaulich-politische Kampf in Rom am Vorabend des Sturzes der Republik*, Berlin [East], 1956).
- UTČENKO, S. L., 1953, Rimskoe Rabovladel'českoe Obščestvo v Seredine II. veka do n.e., in: *V. D. I.* 1953/44 (46), 157-165.
- UTČENKO, S. L., ŠTAERMAN, E. M., 1960, O Nekotorych Voprosach Istorii Rabstva, in: *V. D. I.* 1960/4 (74), 9-21.
- UTČENKO, S. L., 1965, Krizis i Padenie Rimskoj Respubliki, Moscow, 1965.
- UTČENKO, S. L., 1966, 'Antičnost', in: *Očerki Istorii Istoričeskoj Nauki v SSSR*, Moscow, 1966, vol. IV., 577-589.
- UTČENKO, S. L., 1969, Drevnij Rim: Sobytiya, Ljudi, Idei, Moscow, 1969.
- UTČENKO, S. L., D'JAKONOV, I. M., 1969, Social'naja Stratifikacija Drevnego Obščestva, in: *Rapp. des 13 Historikerkongresses 1970*, Moscow, 1971.
- UTČENKO, S. L., 1972, Ciceron i ego Vremja, Moscow, 1972.
- UTČENKO, S. L., 1976, Julij Cezar', Moscow, 1976 (German translation: Berlin [East], 1982).
- * VEICKIVSKIJ, I. I., 1969, Do Istorii Spartakivskogo Povstannija, 73-71 vv. do n. e., in: *Učenyje Zapiski L'vivskogo Deržavnogo Universiteta im. I. Franka*, Vypusk 5, 1969, 89-99.
- * VEICKIVSKIJ, I. I., Do Biografii Spartaka, in: *Učenyje Zapiski L'vivskogo Deržavnogo Universiteta im. I. Franka*, Vypusk 7, 1971, 99-112.
- VEICKIVSKIJ, I. I., 1973, Pro Stan Vivenija Džerel Istorii Spartakivskogo Povstannija, in: *Učenyje Zapiski L'vivskogo Deržavnogo Universiteta im. I. Franka*, Serija Ist. No. 9, 1973, 132-143.
- * VERBRUGGHE, G. P., 1973, The Elogium from Polla and the First Slave War, *Class. Philol.* 68, 1973, 25 ff.
- VESELOVSKIJ, S. B., 1945, Pervyj Opyt Preobrazovanija Central'noj Vlasti pri Ivane Groznom, in: *Istoričeskie Zapiski* XV, 1945, 57-69.
- VITTINGHOFF, F., 1962, Die Sklavenfrage in: der Forschung der Sowjetunion, in: *Gymnasium*, 69, 1962, 279-286.
- VLADIMIROV, L., 1969, Rossiya bez Prikras i Umolčanij, Frankfurt a. M., 1969.
- VORONKOV, A. A., 1961, Drevnjaja Grecija i Drevnij Rim. Bibliografičeskij Ukazatel' 1895-1959, Moscow, 1961.
- VYŠINSKIJ, P., 1961, s. v. Revoljucija, in: *B. S. E.* XLVIII, 393-407, Moscow, 1961.
- * WISEMAN, P. T., 1969, Viae Anniae Again, *P. B. S. R.* 34 (1969) 82 ff.
- YARESH, L., 1956, The Role of the Individual in History, in: C. E. Black, (ed.) 1956, 78-106
- * ZABOROVSKIJ, YA. YU., 1985, *Očerki po Istorii Agrarnykh Otnošenij v Rimskoj Respublike*, L'vov, 1985, 143-189.
- ZAIDEL, G., CVIBAK, M., 1931, (Edd.) Klassovyj Vrag na Istoričeskom Fronte, Moscow-Leningrad, 1931.
- * ZALESKIJ, N., 1946, in: *V. D. I.* 1946/2, pp. 211 ff.

- ŽEBELEV, A. I., 1934, KOVALEV, S. I., Velikie Vosstanija Rabov II-I vekov do n. e., in: *Izvestija G. A. I. M. K.* No. 101, 1934, 139-180.
- ZEVELEV, A. I., PEDOSOV, A. D., 1973, Review of O. D. Sokolov: *M. N. Pookrovskij...* in: *Soviet Studies in History*, 12, 1973, 83-89.
- * ŽIGUNIN, V. D., 1984, Specifika Periodizacii Social'no-Ėkonomičeskich, Političeskich i Kul'turnych Processov, in: *Periodizacija Vsemirnoj Istorii* (Učebnoe posobie), Kazan', 1984, 101-118.
- ZIMIN, A. A., 1960, Reformy Ivana Groznogo, Moscow, 1960
- * ZOTOV, V., 1983, Lenin's Doctrine on National Liberation Revolutions and Modern World (*sic!*), Moscow, 1983 (Library of Political Knowledge, Book 7).
- ZUCHOLD, B., 1979, Zum Problem Evolution oder Revolution in der späten römischen Republik, in: *Klio* 61, 1979, 593-596
- ŽUKOV, E. M., 1975^a, Lenin and the Concept of Epoch in World History, in *Problems of the Contemporary World*, No. 32, Moscow, 1975, pp.5-17
- * ŽUKOV, E. M. (ed.), 1975^a, Problemy Social'no-Ėkonomičeskich Formacij, Moscow, 1975.
- ŽUKOV, E. M., 1980, Očerki Metodologii Istorii, Moscow, 1980.

REFERENCES TO SPARTACUS IN ANCIENT SOURCES

It may be convenient to set out here a list of references to ancient authors who mention or allude to Spartacus. The texts of these passages are quoted in full in G. Stampacchia, 1976, pp. 165-199. Many of these cite Spartacus as a rhetorical *exemplum* of Rome's enemies or for a moralizing purpose, while others are derived from earlier writings and as such add nothing of substance to what was known otherwise. The primary sources are the sections of continuous narrative in Appian, Plutarch's *Life of Crassus* and the some fragments which survive from the third and fourth books of Sallust's *Histories*. The passages are listed in alphabetical order of authors' names.

Ammianus Marcellinus, 14. 11, 33.

Ampelius, 41, 1.

Appian, *Mithr.* 109, 517-520; *Bell. Civ.* I. 110, 517-111, 518; 116, 539-121, 561.

Augustine, *civ. Dei.* 3. 26; 4. 5.

Caecilius of Calacte *apud* Athenaeum VI, 272F-273A (= *FHG* (Jacoby) 183 F 1, vol. IIB, p. 911).

Cicero, *in Verrem* II. 5, 1; 5-7; 14; 39-42; 161; 164-6; *pro Manilio* 30; *har. resp.* 26; *ad Att.* VI. 2, 8; *parad.* 30; *Phil.* III, 21; IV, 15; XIII, 22.

Caesar, *Bell. Gall.* I. 40, 5-6.

Claudian, *in Rufin.* I. 249-56; *Goth.* 154-165.

Diodorus Sic., 38-9, 21. 1

Eutropius, VI, 7. 1-2.

Florus, *epit.* I, 34; II, 8.

Frontinus, *strateg.* I. 5, 20-22; I. 7, 6; II. 4, 7; II. 5, 34.

Fronto, *ad Ver.* II. 1, 20; *princ. hist.* II. 18.

Gellius, *N. A.* V. 6, 23.

Hieronymus-Jerome, *chron. ad Ol.* 176, 3-4; 177, 3.

Horace, *epod.* 16, 5 (and scholia *ad loc.*)

Julianus Capitolin., 9. 3-6.

Julianus apostat., *Caes.* 322C-D.

Livy, *epit.* 95; 96; 97.

Lucan, II. 550-4 (and schol.).

- Orosius, V. 22, 5-8; 24. 1-10; 18-19.
- Panegy. lat. (Pacatus), 12, 23; 12, 45.
- Pliny, *N. Hist.* XV. 125; XXXIII. 49.
- Plutarch, *Crassus*, 8. 1—12. 3; *comp. Nic. et Cr.* 3, 2; 3, 7; *Cat. min.* 8. 1-3; *Pomp.* 21. 1-4; 31. 11-12.
- Sallust, *hist.* III. frs. 90-104 (inclusive; ed. Maurenbrecher). Frs. 96 and 98 are textually gappy, but the general sense emerges). *Ibid.* IV, frs. 22-41; *Ibid.* V. frs. 1; 2; 4.
- Sidonius Apollin. *carm.* II, 235-242; IX, 239-252; *epist.* III. 13, 10.
- Symmachus, *epist.* II. 46, 1-2.
- Synesius, *de regno* 20, 23D-24C.
- Suetonius, *Aug.* 3; *Ibid.* 7.
- Tacitus, *Ann.* III. 73; XV. 46.
- Themistius, *or.* 7, 86B-87A.
- Varro *apud* Charis., I. 133 (Keil).
- Velleius Paterculus, II. 30, 5-6.